DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 135 890 UD 016 724

TITLE	The Desegregation Literature: A Critical Appraisal.
INSTITUTION	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Educational Equity Group. Desegregation Studies Div.
PUB DATE	Jul 76
NOTE	164p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$8.69 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Annotated Bibliographies; Curriculum Problems; Discipline Problems; Integration Litigation; Integration Methods; *Integration Studies; Legal Problems; *Literature Reviews; *Negro Education; *Racial Integration; School Administration; *School Integration; Social Integration

ABSTRACT

This volume contains three analytic literature reviews of desegregation literature. The first review examines trends in the literature of school desegregation and educational inequality from 1960-1975. The second review provides an assessment of conceptual frameworks and methodological orientations concerning interracial schooling. One purpose of this review is to examine the possible association between research methodology and conceptual frameworks. The third review provides an annotated bibliography dealing with research on desegregation in school and classroom settings. It focuses on a field methods approach for studying the patterns and dynamics of socialization in desegregated settings. (Author/AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED135890

THE DESEGREGATION LITERATURE:

A Critical Appraisal

July 1976

UD016724

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
David Mathews, Secretary
National Institute of Education
Harold L. Hodgkinson, Director
Educational Equity Group
Harold Delaney, Associate Director
Desegregation Studies Staff
Ray C. Rist, Chief

JAN 27 1977

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE **PAGE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I. School Desegregation and Educational Inequality: Trends in The Literature, 1960-1975 **1**

Dorothy C. Clement
Margaret Eisenhart
John W. Wood

I. Introduction 1
II. Frameworks: General Perspectives on School Desegregation 3
III. Litigation, Legislation, and Enforcement 10
IV. Extent and Causes of Educational Inequality 23
V. Remedial Efforts and Counter Forces in Implementation 31
VI. Research on Outcomes of Desegregation 46
VII. References 57

CHAPTER II. The Process of Interracial Schooling: An Assessment of Conceptual Frameworks and Methodological Orientations **79**

Thomas W. Collins
George W. Noblit

Introduction 79
Organization of the Literature Review 79
Law and Politics 80
Community Concerns 82
School Administration 83
Order and Discipline 86
Curriculum and Instruction 88
Faculty 90
Extraschool Factors 92
Consequences for Students 95
References 100

CHAPTER III. Research on Desegregation in School and Classroom Settings **111**

Rodney Riffel
Francis A. J. Ianni
Margaret Orr
Elizabeth Reuss-Ianni
Audrey Savwoir
Andrea Sparks

Preface 111
The Socio-Legal History of Desegregation in America 112
The Effects of Desegregation in the Classroom 117
Acculturation, Ethnicity, and Desegregation 143
The Labeling Perspective and Desegregation 151
Implications for Classroom Observation 156
Synthesis and Conclusions ....
References ....

PREFACE

It is only a statement of the obvious to note that yet twenty-three years after the Supreme Court Decision of *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, the United States continues to grapple with the issue of school desegregation. While tremendous strides have been made in the desegregation of public education, there have also been more than isolated instances of resistance to this effort at social change. The constitutional mandate is clear; the legal precedents have been firmly established. The question is no longer one of whether to integrate schools, but rather how to do so.

Amidst this more than two decades of school desegregation debate, behavioral and social science evidence and the scientists themselves have been actively involved. From even before the time of the Supreme Court citation of social science evidence in the *Brown* decision, there has continued to the present a vigorous effort to assess, analyze, interpret, and describe the processes and outcomes of school desegregation. These data have provided information on such diverse factors as self esteem, academic achievement, interpersonal relations, tolerance, educational aspirations, and aptitude. There have also been a multitude of studies on school administration, school climate, school-community relations, school curriculum, and school faculties in desegregated settings.

The National Institute of Education is pleased to present in this volume three efforts by distinguished researchers to gather, interpret, and summarize major portions of the desegregation literature. Moving beyond simple bibliographies, annotated or not, these three papers provide significant contributions through their systematic and coherent summaries of a literature that is threatening to become an avalance of reports, articles, books, papers, conference proceedings, and manuscripts in draft form. We trust that others will find these critical assessments of the literature as beneficial and stimulating as have we here at the Institute.

Ray C. Rist,
Head, Desegregation Studies Staff
Educational Equity Group

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION AND EDUCATIONAL INEQUALITY: TRENDS IN THE LITERATURE, 1960-1975

Dorothy C. Clement
Margaret Eisenhart
John R. Wood
University of
North Carolina
Chapel Hill,
North Carolina

1. INTRODUCTION

I. 1. Objectives

Desegregation of schools in the United States has been referred to as a "peacetime social revolution". At the least, school desegregation is part of a social movement, a trend in social and cultural change which has organized proponents and opponents—the former seeking to modify the status quo while the latter try to reinforce and strengthen it. School desegregation is part of a movement the aim of which, conceptualized most generally, is removal of caste-like aspects of American society.

The process of school desegregation has and is taking place in an evolving context forged at each stage from the interaction of parties having differing visions, desires, and interests. The evidence of this evolution is captured in the literature on school desegregation which fixes concepts, tactics, and approaches in their respective time frames. In the fifteen years that this review covers, it is possible to trace significant alterations in perspectives on desegregation and their resulting conceptual manifestations. The de facto-de jure distinction, for example, utilized heavily in the 1960's to calm urban fears has undergone a shift: the domain of de jure has been greatly expanded. Battles over token desegregation have been replaced by struggle over metropolitan desegregation. And, equality of educational opportunity has undergone a number of reconceptualizations.

To use the metaphor of a contest, the contest which desegregation constitutes is one in which the rules change, the goals change, and even to some extent the composition of the "sides" change over time. In order to follow the contemporary events and anticipate future events, it is helpful to know who the participants are, what resources they use, the perceptions which those using the resources have, and the history behind the events. School desegregation is the product of many different participants: the federal and state courts, legislatures, and executives; local school and federal administrators; strong citizens groups; the public; and social scientists. The courts have made decisions which educational decision-makers normally make; the federal government has taken a much greater role in educational programs than ever before; and social science has been given a role, albeit a disputed one, in court decisions. We assume that to separate out the legal, political, educational, and cultural strands of school desegregation is impossible at this juncture. For that reason, it seemed most meaningful in conceptualizing this review to think of the literature as representing the country's growing pool of knowledge and beliefs about school desegregation. We have tried to judge the articles and books in terms of their informational content relative to the development of the desegregation movement rather than judging their content relative to some set of disciplinary standards such as soundness of research.

We have attempted to place the developments in a larger context. Research reports, for example, may stress or not stress findings depending, one might guess, on factors affecting the researcher. Similarly, one finds that some questions are asked while others are ignored just as court decisions are not necessarily the product of logical deduction from the legal charter. Our orientation has been to pay attention to changes in definitions and methods that pertain to desegregation and to guide the reader to sources which expand upon and reference particular topics.

Ultimately, it will be useful to analyze school desegregation in terms of its impact on American society and institutions. In the long run, it may become evident that the civil rights movement contributed to the decay of social stratification in American society; alternatively, its effects may be negligible, evidence only of the stability of the American dilemma. We believe that the place of the desegregation movement in history is not clear at this time, although, of course, there are many who have prophesied its consequences and there are social science theories which would generate a position. Instead, we have chosen to present the literature more in its own terms, that is, in terms of the issues and solutions as they have been and are conceptualized by those who have been active in affecting policy and practice.

I.2. Sources and Format

In compiling a basic set of references on school desegregation, six types of sources were utilized. Two of these were computerized searches using the DIALOG Search Service (natural language searches). One search was of titles and abstracts present in the Educational Resource Information Center files (ERIC). The other was a similar search of *Psychological Abstracts.* Both searches used a set of twenty descriptors to locate relevant desegregation references. A third computerized search was done of *Sociological Abstracts*, using the facilities of the University of Georgia. Due to various complications, it was possible to search only one volume (21, 1973) of *Sociological Abstracts.* A fourth source of references was obtained from manual searches of the materials on hand at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill campus library. The fifth reference source was a series of bibliographies on school desegregation. These included Weinberg's (1970) compendium of 10,000 selected references on *The Education of the Minority Child*; (his newer edition was not available for use), De'Ath, Gibbons, and O'Neil's (1969) *Black Education and Black Society in the United States: a Bibliography for Development Educators;* the University of Florida Library's (1960, 1962) *Segregation and Desegregation in American Education;* Meyer Weinberg's (1967) *School Integration: a Comprehensive Classified Bibliography of 3,100 References*; and the bibliography from Ray C. Rist's (n.d.) forthcoming book concerning desegregation. In addition, Burnett's (1974) bibliography of *Anthropology and Education* sources was searched for anthropological sources on desegregation. Finally, various recent issues of journals devoted to desegregation-related topics were reviewed. (It should be noted that references which dealt solely with minority groups other than black Americans were eliminated from the set of sources.)

The resulting set of items, which numbered approximately 1500, was viewed as a sample of the literature from which basic trends in the literature could be ascertained. Counting on the fact that some important works might have been omitted in our initial search, we proceeded to develop categorizations of the literature and to obtain copies of material mentioned, but not included, among our original items.

As described above, we viewed the materials as indicative of conceptualizations of school desegregation and educational inequality as well as descriptive of events and positions relevant to desegregation. Thus, items in popular as well as academic journals were read in preparation of the overview.

The review is divided into six major areas. Discussions in each sub-section present overviews of particular areas, emphasizing trends in the conceptualizations and events relating to those areas. References are interspersed in the context of those overviews.

At the end of some of the sub-sections, more general references are mentioned by author and date. There has been no attempt to list all possible references for each area. Instead, the objective was to include: 1) examples of points of view and types of research, 2) major or central items, and 3) general references providing bibliographies for further reading. Published materials were given priority over unpublished materials.

The full reference for each item mentioned is listed alphabetically by author in the final reference section. Due to space limitations, only those items not described in the text which seem of particular value were annotated. Following each reference is a number indicating the sub-section(s) in which the reference is discussed.

II. FRAMEWORKS: GENERAL PERSPECTIVES ON SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

School desegregation symbolizes far more to Americans than the elimination of laws requiring school segregation. It symbolizes possible futures for individual children and for the country. These visions of the future brought about by integration give meaning to the events that occur and have occurred in the process of school desegregation. They provide the context in which courses of action are evaluated, research questions are formulated, alternatives are weighed, and policy is developed.

Twenty years ago, the ideals symbolized by school desegregation were not completely articulated and the means for achieving the transformation were nowhere spelled out. As the means were developed and tried, concepts underwent reinterpretation and refinement. Perspectives on school desegregation changed and diversified.

In spite of the proliferation and changes in perspectives associated with school desegregation, it is possible, through some oversimplification, to trace the development of three distinctive perspectives which have informed the action of those involved in struggles over school desegregation. These perspectives are described below under the rubrics of "forced integration/forced busing", "the American Creed", and "the promise of *Brown*".

The perspective which can be associated with most of the proponents of school desegregation is labled "the American Creed", because of its emphasis upon the egalitarian principles of the society as the over-arching motivation for school desegregation. Representing the mainstream position, this perspective appears to be the one held by many of the members of the judiciary, social scientists, "liberal" whites, and active civil rights groups such as the NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People) who have been active in promoting school desegregation. These groups and individuals see themselves as the offensive against anti-desegregationists whose perspective is labeled "forced mixing/forced busing".

Segregationists in the South resisted school desegregation. Currently desegregation is being resisted in some other regions of the country where busing is used as a means of achieving school desegregation in residentially segregated areas. Although those who protest busing are not popularly considered to be segregationists, their viewpoints are similar enough to those of the segregationists that they can, without too much violence to their position, be placed in the same category.

Proponents of the third perspective, labeled "the promise of *Brown*", are predominantly black people* who became discouraged with the progress of school desegregation. Diverging from the "American Creed" perspective, these individuals, who include black social scientists, educators, and civil rights and community leaders, have turned away from visions of America as a unitary society to visions of America as a culturally and structurally plural society.

In the fourth section, the three perspectives are collapsed yet again as alternatives of a single paradigm.

II. 1. Forced Mixing/Forced Busing

To segregationists the *Brown* decision meant that white children would be forced by law to associate with people whom the segregationists considered morally, intellectually, and physically inferior. They were afraid their children would suffer spiritual, mental, and perhaps physical harm as a result of desegregation. In public, however, segregationists did not propound these racist views as much as they pointed to the aspect of imposition. They argued that Supreme Court justices had usurped the law-making power of Congress, establishing their own political and social views as the law of the land. ("The Southern Manifesto" of 1956 is included in Humphrey 1964.) When the federal agencies became involved in enforcement, the white southerners again complained, claiming that administration demands were illegal and disruptive of local systems (Orfield 1975). Along with force, the Southern segregationists later included in their position the theme of unfair treatment of the South. Although under a special obligation to desegregate because of the use of state power to promote and maintain segregation, the constituencies of the Southern congressmen and senators began to complain of the relative lack of enforcement of segregation remedies in the urban North and West. On this basis, Southern senators in 1968, for example, demanded that half of the enforcement efforts conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare be aimed at non-Southern cases.

---

*A review of school desegregation as it has affected non-black minority groups is outside the scope of this paper.

The shift of emphasis on enforcement of desegregation to the urban North and West, which began to occur in the late 1960's, stimulated opposition in those areas which to some degree has been more successful than the resistance encountered in the South. The public outcry in these Northern areas has taken a different form than in the South, however. While white people in the North, according to their verbalized statements, tend to be more accepting than Southern whites of the idea of black students in their children's schools, they have resisted the buses which transport the students from segregated neighborhoods. Interestingly, certain segregationist themes are apparent in the ideas of some so-called nonsegregationists. Two of the myths held by white and middle-income parents, which Sullivan (1968) lists as those associated with desegregation, are fears that social race and social class integration will result in educational degradation for the middle- and upper-class whites and that violence will threaten the safety of the students. Similarly, the notion of cultural deprivation which posited educational, cultural, and behavioral "gaps" between the advantaged (usually white middle- and upper-income) and the disadvantaged (usually low-income and often minority) could be seen as a refined "scientific" version of some of the segregationists' ideas about the inferiority of black people. The main difference seems to lie in the permanence of the attributed inferiority. The cultural deprivationists thought the gaps could be narrowed, whereas the segregationists posited no basis for change. The nature of the urban resistance to plans to achieve desegregation which focused upon "forced" busing was also foreshadowed by Southern public outcry over the use of force. (See NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund 1973 on the busing controversy.)

For a period during the 1960's, desegregation for those who did not desire black-white mixing became associated with "the law of the land"; they thus assumed that desegregation would have to be accomplished sooner or later. During this period, national support for enforcement of desegregation was high. All three branches of federal government and a great deal of popular support coalesced for a period behind civil rights and school desegregation. The tide of this national support crested in 1964-1966 and then receded. Nixon's policies did not continue the movement's momentum and in fact tended to reverse it. Since 1969, forestalling desegregation through "legal" means, especially in the urban areas, has continued to be possible. Meanwhile, for some areas that have already desegregated, the 1974 School Aid bill opened the possibility that the pressure to maintain desegregated schools will be reduced. A section of the bill allows a court or agency to declare that the results of intentional segregation have been eradicated, and that, in effect, the officials are freed from responsibility for resegregation in case of population movement. When legislators and presidents began taking an active part in advising enforcement agencies in certain cases, busing, permissible resegregation, and the segregated neighborhood school acquired roles as political footballs. The aura of law which had become associated with school desegregation dissipated in the midst of political maneuverings.

II. 2. The American Creed

The "mainstream" or predominant perspective on school desegregation, held by most of the individuals who have been active in promoting school desegregation, is often couched in terms of American ideology. Especially in the beginning stages, school desegregation was spoken of in light of egalitarian principles propounded as the bedrock of American society. Since that period this position has undergone a number of reconceptualizations, changes in emphasis, and, to some extent, a fragmentation. This perspective and its changes over time are outlined below.

The discrepancy between American idealogy and the realities of the society's treatment of black citizens was articulated by Myrdal (1944) as "an American dilemma." Discrimination on the basis of skin color was protested as being inconsistent with the egalitarian principles of the society. The Supreme Court in the 1954 *Brown* decision symbolized to some that the United States would be brought closer to the ideals which it professed: an open and democratic society in which equal opportunity for all is a reality. The disgrace of a legally-supported caste-like system would be eliminated and the terrible psychological damage done to black children would be halted.

Some attention has been devoted to predictions of long-run costs of apartheid to the society in terms of violence and debilitating exploitation as a whole (see, for example, Levine 1969), but a more predominant theme has been the evils of discrimination, prejudice, and racism as they affect the non-white portion of the population. The *Brown* case brought to national consciousness the inequality of black education in states where blacks were barred by law from attending schools with whites - an incontestable indication of the stigma of blackness. Vividly portrayed on national TV as well, in the early 1960's, was the sight of peaceful civil right demonstrators lead by Dr. King being attacked by dogs and fire hoses. At this time, blacks as the victims of Southern social injustice became prominent as a national concern.

The remedial efforts required by the courts adjudicating school desegregation cases were based upon the illegality of school segregation and associated assumptions about the damaging nature of apartheid institutions for blacks. In these cases black-white mixing, and in some cases racial balance, evolved as the standard which systems previously segregated by law had to meet to show that the illegal dual system had been eliminated. The courts came to require outcomes concretely visible in the form of the presence of black and white students in the same school building. Tangible results were required because stated policies of equal opportunity could not be trusted. It was found that color-blind laws, such as freedom of choice attendance plans, had few results since whites resisted even "token desegregation" through various formal and informal means, causing blacks to be apprehensive about leaving relatively safe segregated schools to enter racially tense desegregated schools. As a result of the courts insistence on mixing, white schoolmates became identified as a necessary component of the provision of equal educational opportunity for black children (Edmonds 1973).

This trend was affected by the Coleman, et al. (1966) government-funded nationwide survey of school conditions and student achievement. Coleman's study had a large impact on the development of the concept of equal education opportunity. For one thing, the Coleman report drew specific attention to the distinction between educational resources and educational outcomes. Prior to the 1960's the schools were seen as a resource provided to the public. At that time, equal opportunity meant equal access to equivalent schools. During the 1960's, the definition shifted to mean access to equal effects (see Section III). (Coleman 1968 attributes the explicit emphasis on equal outputs as opposed to equal inputs to the Office of Education's survey on equal education opportunity in 1966. (See also White 1974 and Mosteller and Moynihan 1972.) Better educational opportunity for blacks became associated with closing the educational achievement gap between blacks and whites.

Secondly, the Coleman report undercut what some desegregationists had considered to be a major reason why black children in segregated schools did poorly. Coleman's findings did not support the belief that black schools were inferior in facilities. Instead they seemed to indicate that black and white schools in each region of the country were roughly equivalent in terms of facilities; that white children had higher scores on achievement tests than black children in each region of the country, and that the small differences which did exist among schools did not seem to account for differences in performance.

In an article assessing the developments following *Brown*, D. Cohen (1974:40) makes the following observation:

> *Brown* was epochal not simply because of its impact on race relations, but because it was a remarkable synthesis of diverse ideas about equality, race, and education.

As Cohen goes on to point out, this synthesis was wrenched apart. The breakdown of the synthesis was especially acute for researchers affected by Coleman's survey. If differences between black/white educational outcomes were not explained by schools, then how were they to be explained? A variety of different ideas came to the fore, including genetic inferiority, social and cultural inferiority, and cultural differences. Coleman's data seemed to support the position that family and community background were of major importance. This view was compatible with a major remedial program instituted in the War on Poverty.

One of the thrusts of President Johnson's poverty program was based upon the assumption that education could break the cycle of poverty by providing special education to children from disadvantaged home backgrounds. Eligibility for remedial programs was determined (until recently) by income level, thus including many of the black children since blacks are over represented among the poor. Compensatory education as these remedial programs were known, came to be conceptualized by some as an alternative to desegregation. If the quality of education for blacks could be improved through these remedial programs, then they would be able to participate equally in American society and the process of school desegregation would be unnecessary. Others (Cohen 1968) argued that both desegregation and remedial programs were necessary. (See Schwartz, et al. 1968 who discuss proposed alternatives to desegregation.)

On the one hand, Coleman's findings because they distracted attention from any link between social race,* segregation, and equal educational opportunity, opened the way for alternative explanations of lower black performance. On the other hand, his findings were taken by some as supporting the need for desegregation. His results did show some limited gains for black students in majority white schools. Secondly, his findings that peer group characteristics had an important effect on achievement was taken as an indication of support for desegregation since children with middle- and upper-income school peers tended to do better on achievement tests. The reasoning was that integration by social race would tend to produce social-class integration since blacks are predominantly from lower-income backgrounds and, thus, black scores would improve as a result of exposure to middle- and upper-class children.

In the popular press, Coleman's findings also promoted a de-emphasis on the effects of purposive isolation or stigmatization. In its place, as a result of the over-simplification of the Coleman findings, grew the notion that all-black institutions were harmful for black students. Black institutions were inferior not because of lack of resources but because of lack of whites. The idea that mixture represented an end to segregation as well as a necessity for equal educational opportunity (outcomes) became even more firmly entrenched. As a result, "white flight" and related trends began to be perceived as a major problem because they decreased the number of whites in the desegregated schools. There were cautions given that demands for racial balance in places where the black percentage was over the "tipping point" would cause white flight and thus eliminate the possibility for black gains associated with desegregation. (See Coleman 1975 for example, who argues that white flight has important policy implications.)

---

*"Social race" or "color" is used whenever possible in place of "race" in order to distinguish between "race" as a biological concept pertaining to populations and "race" as a diffuse status characteristic used primarily in reference to individuals. (See Harris 1975.) "Social race" is used to refer to the latter meaning.

It is difficult to ascertain how much the courts were affected by the Coleman findings and the reanalysis of his findings by Jencks, et al. (1972) which suggested that not only did school facilities not affect achievement, but that number of years in school did not correlate with adult income. The courts, in spite of these well-publicized findings suggesting the irrelevance of facilities and even education in general (to use a popular interpretation of Jencks' findings), continued to require desegregation and continued to consider cases calling for equalization of school facilities based on equal protection guaranteed by the Constitution. (See Section III.1.f.)

Support for desegregation also decreased in other quarters. Especially in the 1970's there was strong pressure in Congress to limit the powers of the courts to order busing. (See Section III.2.) Even the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, a constant proponent of desegregation, seems to have decreased its emphasis on desegregation as a goal.* Although it is difficult to assess the impact of these trends on the courts, the judiciary, in any event, continued to be responsive to black plaintiffs claiming violation of their Constitutional rights.

The amount of money funneled by the federal government into remedial programs, the subsequent development of compensatory education programs, and the preoccupation in scientific circles with Coleman's data overshadowed a realization that was quite clear to many blacks: namely, that being in the same school building does not assure acceptance as an equal. Soon the courts were faced with cases dealing with "second generation" problems or devices such as tracking which had the effect of segregating students within the same school building (see Section IV). There developed in this regard a distinction between the frequent attainment of mixed student bodies and the envisioned result of a school in which skin color was irrelevant. (See Pettigrew 1969b or Krovetz 1972, for example.) The term "desegregation" came to be used to refer to the former while the latter came to be referred to by some as "integration".**

Research also contributed to another reconceptualization of desegregation, this time in accord with the courts. In the beginning, the courts focused primarily upon segregation that had formerly been sanctioned by law. There was a distinction made between de jure segregation and de facto segregation. The segregation in the South was associated with law. In the North and West, however, it was popularly assumed that segregation resulted not from law, but was de facto, a fortuitous consequence of residential patterns, immune to the *Brown* decision and therefore immune to federal enforcement mechanisms established in Congress. (See Orfield 1969b.) The basis for maintaining the distinction between de jure and de facto segregation has been seriously eroded by research which indicates that as far as effects on black children are concerned, de jure is difficult to distinguish from de facto segregation. The distinction between de jure and de facto segregation became even less tenable when it became clear that actions of school boards in "de facto" areas were, for all intents and purposes, often done to promote school segregation. (See, for example, Pettigrew 1969b.) The courts responded to this type of intentional segregation as they had to intentional segregation by statute. Desegregation was ordered.

The response to the desegregation of urban areas, which often involves busing, has been vociferous. As described in the previous section, there has been an outcry of protests in the Northern as well as the Southern cities.

---

*The NAACP Legal Defense Fund agreement to drop prosecution in Atlanta in return for guarantees of black positions is seen by Cohen (1974) as a reordering of priorities.

**Integration is used by others to refer to a situation in which all participate as equals with differences being respected. For an example of this definition see Sizemore (1972).

The 1970's in particular have been an era of fragmentation of the "American Creed" perspective. To some degree the symbolic value of school desegregation as a step in the direction of realizing equality has been eroded and the ideal of equality as a result of efforts to translate it into measurable standards has become murky.

II. 3. The Promise of *Brown*.

For black people, *Brown* held promise for society in general but more importantly it held promise for their children. *Brown* seemed to promise better educational opportunities for black children. In 1954, black people could share with white "liberals" the dream of the United States as an open, democratic society which they hoped would be realized in their childrens' if not their own lifetime.

In pursuit of the anticipated future, groups such as the NAACP worked to bring compliance with the Supreme Court's decision and black children tried to take advantage of the opportunity created by the courts. Resistance to black attendance, in the form of indecision and inaction, economic and physical reprisals, and the inaction of the president and Congress to overcome white resistance, however, soon dispelled any expectations that securement of those guaranteed rights would come rapidly.

In the ensuing struggle, the realities of desegregation and equal educational opportunity as they were being defined by the courts and by federal programs failed to match original hopes. "Racial balance" did not seem very effective in eliminating discrimination or in producing better educational opportunities. (See, for example, Banks 1972.) To some it became increasingly clear that desegregation did not mean integration; that desegregation did not mean that whites would accept blacks as equals; that integration was not feasible given white racism; and that even desegregation as defined by the courts would be slow in coming. Desegregation as it was evolving was seen as just another routine of the same act of enforcement of white superiority. It was not a road to better educational opportunity, but in fact had succeeded in eliminating many of the teaching and administrative positions blacks had held (before desegregation). (See Billings 1972 for another association between desegregation developments and teaching jobs.) It was also based on assumptions that were now repugnant to some blacks, namely that black institutions were inferior and that black children must be associated with white children in order to learn. As CORE (the Congress of Racial Equality) articulated the evaluation: "Blacks who have gone along with integration have done so in search of dignity, but have found humiliation at the end of the rainbow" (1973:316). Some even began to ask whether the education offered by the schools, particularly the values stressed in the schools, were really what they wanted their children to learn (Hamilton 1968).

The "remarkable" switch from Civil Rights Movement to Black Power is not so remarkable when perceived in this light. Black spokespeople began to consider alternatives to desegregation for achieving better education. (See Bell 1970, 1975b, for example.) The crucial element did not seem to be access to white school buildings. The route to equality instead now seemed to lie in access to power over schools. (Again, see Congress of Racial Equality 1973, for example.)

The sharing of power suggested to some that there must be a structural change in how institutions are administrated and how decision-makers are designated. Administration must be reorganized to include more input from the local black community. "Community controlled" systems (see Section V. 3.) became the desired outcome of those seeking structural change in decision making.*

At present there is no prominent symbol unifying support for the educational rights of minorities. Instead, the school bus is in ascendancy as the symbol of resistance to forced desegregation. It has been suggested that there is and has been a relative disunity among blacks since the mid 1960's when some of the direct-action civil rights groups became more militant. Plans for redistributing power such as described by Sizemore (1972) are quite complex and the efforts of black educators such as Sizemore to restructure school systems have not yet produced new unifying conceptualizations.

---

*It is interesting to note that community control plans were considered either counter to the goals of desegregation or not feasible by individuals having other perspectives, e.g., those holding the "American Creed". (See, for example, Cohen 1969 and Schwartz, et al. 1968.)

(See Bell 1970, 1975b for detailed descriptions of black disenchantment with desegregation.)

II. 4. A Broader Context

It is possible to put the three perspectives described above into a single context. Ogbu (n.d.), an anthropologist, in a comparative study of minority education in six societies, including the United States, argues that the future possibility for equal participation of a minority group in major institutions and equal access to resources affects the type of formal education they are provided as well as the type of socialization they receive in their homes. School desegregation and the frames of reference associated with it (described above) involve implicit if not explicit assumptions about the future participation envisioned for black Americans.

The ferment for change in minority status sparked by the *Brown* decision encompassed two basic types of reformative visions: 1) assimilative and 2) pluralistic (see Rist 1974b.)

Assimilative approaches envision the integration of minority individuals into the mainstream institutions. The remedial policy seeks to open the way for the minority person through enculturation or acculturation into the mainstream culture so that he or she behaves as a non-minority person would. Through successful assimilation, the minority members would be absorbed and lose their distinctiveness.

The pluralistic vision, on the other hand, does not call for the elimination of distinctive groups. Pluralistic models vary in terms of the types of separation between groups, the degree of cultural distinctiveness, and the degree of shared control over public institutions that is envisioned. Models which emphasize the maintenance of distinctive cultural patterns (e.g., dialect) among groups are referred to as cultural pluralism. Models which emphasize the maintenance of separate institutions (e.g., schools) for each group are referred to as structural pluralism.

The assimilationist model can be associated with those who emphasize American egalitarian principles. Although the emphasis is upon equal treatment, remedial efforts are generated to minimize the difference between minority and non-minority individuals. Rist (1974b:61), in describing the assimilative approach includes the following:

> To operationalize this alternative /assimilation/ for school integration, it would suggest there be few numbers of non-white children among many whites. In this way, there would be no danger of sufficient numbers of blacks or other non-white students having the opportunity to reinforce within their peer group any traits that would be perceived as non-white.

Cultural pluralists* pay more attention to cultural factors than do assimilationists. They seek the remodeling of the educational system so that it responds more favorably to cultural diversity. The goal of cultural pluralism is that minority group cultural patterns be respected, reinforced, and utilized in school while the child is also being prepared for equal participation in the dominant institutions which control adult life. (See Valentine 1971 for a refinement on this position.) An important question concerning cultural pluralism as it is now envisioned in education is whether multiculturalism is feasible in an institution controlled and developed for individuals of the dominant background (Rist 1974b:62).

Alternatives to assimilative and cultural pluralistic approaches began to receive attention in the late 1960's, especially from black people discouraged with the failure of the promise of *Brown* to materialize. Power was recognized as important, leading to the adoption of structural pluralistic models. Minority group members concerned with structural pluralism emphasize increased control over vital institutions affecting their lives. Separatism, the establishment of completely separate institutions and communities as advocated by Black Nationalists, was a route to increasing control which attracted attention in the late 1960's. (See Feagin 1971 on separatist models.)

---

*Most researchers and educators attracted by the argument that the achievement gap between blacks and whites is a result of cultural differences rather than deficits support cultural pluralism as a meaningful model for present and future America.

Segregationists, too, seek separate institutions and communities, but their vision includes maintenance of inferior and restrictive separate institutions for minority groups. They believe for various reasons (genetic inferiority, cultural deprivation, poor educational background, lack of motivation) that most minority individuals are unable or unwilling to assimilate. Non-segregationists who are concerned with power (some of whom are also separatists), on the other hand, advocate alternative educational institutions and/or alternative routes to achieving equal voice in controlling vital institutions. Community control and decentralization are seen by some as routes to structural pluralism. Others discuss the necessity for what may be an even more fundamental structural change before the promise of *Brown* can be realized. (See Valentine 1971 and Sizemore 1972.)

III. LITIGATION, LEGISLATION, AND ENFORCEMENT

The perspectives described in Section II are held by individuals who have influenced the direction of school desegregation as judges, as legislators, as local school officials, as rioters, as presidents, as researchers, as civil rights leaders, and as community leaders. These individuals participate in various governmental bodies and organizations each of which have their own history of participation in school desegregation. In this section, literature on the roles of governmental bodies and voluntary civil rights organizations is discussed. Two other sections, IV and VI, concern the contribution of researchers to desegregation, while section V focuses upon local community response to desegregation and to educational programs associated with desegregated schools.

III. 1. Litigation

III. 1.a. The role of the judiciary in school desegregation. On May 17, 1954, referred to as "Black Monday" by the segregationists, the Supreme Court announced a unanimous decision striking down the *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* 1896 doctrine of "separate but equal" which allowed as Constitutional state statutes requiring or permitting apartheid schooling. Henceforth, the states were required to provide educational opportunities to all on equal terms. According to the Court, separate educational facilities were inherently unequal. (See Kirp and Yudof 1974 for discussion and commentary.) Thereafter followed a massive number of court cases dealing with whether violations of the law had occurred and what remedies were permissible in bringing relief to black citizens. In effect, the courts assumed a major burden, especially in the ten years following *Brown*, for devising standards for and seeing to the implementation of desegregation (see Read 1975).

In February of 1976, the National Insitute of Education convened an international Symposium to explore the "increasing role of the courts in the formulation of educational policy at local, state, and federal levels." The recognition of the increased role of the courts is not new and has not gone unassessed. (See for example, Kirp and Yudof, 1974.) Theoretically, the burden of implementation of the *Brown* decision and its progeny could have been, and in some cases was, undertaken by local and state officials on a voluntary basis. Certainly the congressmen and the presidents who held office in the period 1954-1974 had the authority to relieve the courts of more of their burden than they did. Resistance on the local and state levels, especially in the South where most of the *Brown I* cases had originated, and at the national level, however, threw the bulk of the responsibility upon the federal courts. The lower federal courts particularly were called upon to make decision after decision concerning the legality of efforts to avoid desegregation. At times the only other bodies devoted to the implementation of the law were civil rights organizations such as SNCC (Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee), SCLC (Southern Christian Leadership Conference), and most prominently, the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund which figured in financing and arguing many court cases. Local and state officials, for the most part, devoted their energy to stalling the desegregation process. School desegregation struggles cost a great deal of anguish, as well as lives in some cases. To some degree, they also diverted energy and money away from the development of new educational policy, programs, and facilities to accommodate desegregation.

This diversion of energy is well portrayed in congressional struggles over civil rights provisions in appropriations bills. Beginning in the 1950's, Congressman Adam Clayton Powell, Jr. attempted to bring about a provision to prevent the support of segregated districts by federal funds. After the short period of relatively strong national and executive support for civil rights which saw the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Bill and a period of rather strong enforcement by HEW and the Justice Departments, Congress became an arena for efforts to curb desegregation momentum. This was primarily through anti-busing amendments attached to appropriations bills. The energy devoted to struggles over the anti-busing amendments were such that the main content or purposes of the bills were relatively ignored. In 1974, the Congress came close to approving amendments which would have brought them into confrontation with the Judiciary over desegregation.

It remains to be seen, now that the desegregation battle has shifted in earnest to the urban areas of the North and West and now that anti-busing forces have come so strongly to the fore, whether the courts will continue to play the same forefront role that they have in the last twenty years. Based upon the decision handed down in *Milliken* v. *Bradley* wherein the school district lines were accepted as the division beyond which the Court would not cross (barring further evidence) in proposing remedies to desegregation, some have predicted that the use of the Constitution alone as a means for achieving school desegregation has reached its limit. Others suggest that the decision against metropolitan desegregation plans is a product of a "Nixon-packed" court which will result in the prevention of major school desegregation in the urban North as well as the urban South. Thus, the current situation in which Southern public education is more desegregated than Northern public education may continue.

(Further references: Peltason 1961 describes the position of the judges of the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit who were for the most part native Southerners put into the position of effecting a very unpopular policy. Bell 1975a suggests factors affecting the Court's Milliken decision. For accounts of the judicial struggle see Levin and Moise 1975, Read 1975, and Bell 1975b. Also see Orfield 1969b.)

III. 1.b. Desegregation Cases in the South—De Jure Segregation. The *Brown* decision of 1954 invalidated the use of the power of the state to promote and maintain dual schooling systems based upon social race. It did not, however, specify what would constitute evidence of a unitary system nor what methods would be permissible in achieving a unitary system. Neither did it provide a time frame for the conversion. *Brown II*, the implementation decision, basically handed the problem back to the lower federal courts although some vague directives such as the "all deliberate speed" clause were included. The possibilities were so great that a federal judge in South Carolina ruled on one of the "Brown" cases remanded to his court that the Constitution forbids discrimination but does not require integration. This minimum interpretation enunciated in the *Briggs* v. *Elliot* decision of 1955 was not laid to rest until 1966 (Read 1975).

The lower courts had been told that desegregation must take place but not how much must take place, how it must take place, what in fact constituted a violation of the law, or what political entity was responsible for getting the job done. The evolution of standards and criteria for judging the occurrence of a violation and for assessing the legality of a remedy has proceeded apace as forces for and against desegregation demanded answers from the court. The ingenuity of the pro-segregation forces in devising means of avoidance and the diligence of the voluntary associations formed to secure the promise of Brown pushed the courts to rule on many permutations and methods. The process still continues.

The more clear-cut violations of the law were found in the South where state statutes provided a legal foundation for the dual system. Cases brought for black plaintiffs were based on fairly obvious violations of the federal law. Nonetheless, court decisions in favor of the plaintiffs were met with resistance on the part of the local and state officials and vocal members of the white population. George Wallace's effort to bar Vivian Malone and James Hood from matriculating at the University of Alabama and the activities of the then Governor of Arkansas, Faubus, to bar entry to a Little Rock High School to eight black students through use of the Arkansas National Guard are symbols of the era of outspoken resistance to desegregation in the South.

From this period until the middle sixties, remedies accepted by the courts produced, at the maximum, only very limited visible results. The defendants in the Southern cases argued for "color-blind" or "racially" neutral policies, such as pupil placement laws and freedom of choice attendance plans which formally allowed, but did not require desegregation. These plans met what was first thought of as the intent of the law, but in actual practice as a result of white social and economic sanctions against black desegregators, did very little to promote any observable difference in school populations. These limited results came to be referred to as "token desegregation" as the number of students remaining in all black institutions became the most important criterion in desegregation cases.

In the middle and late 1960's, coinciding with a national concern with civil rights, the lower courts adopted a new stance. They turned away from accepting token desegregation to requiring massive desegregation. The cases of *United States* v. *Jefferson County Board of Education* and *Singleton* v. *Jackson Municipal Separate School District* were significant in this regard as was *Green* v. *County School Board*. These cases set the tone for ordering massive desegregation in which *Brown* was interpreted as charging the school authorities with eliminating racial discrimination "root and branch." The HEW (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare) guidelines for assessing compliance were given weight by the court as standards for compliance. Desegregation in the South, especially the rural South, proceeded at a rapid pace.

In the 1970's, the attention of the courts shifted to Northern and Western cases, most of which involved urban areas. Early images of school segregation stemmed from the rural South where white controlled local governments barred blacks from full participation by force of law. In urban areas, especially those in the North and West, the discriminatory actions of white-controlled governmental bodies have been less blatant and certainly not inscribed as a right in law books. The blurring of the distinction between de jure and de facto segregation, however, had produced a similar blurring of the distinction between segregation in the South versus the North. As the courts in the 1970's have moved to consideration of urban segregation in both the North and South, the North-South distinction has to some extent been replaced by a rural-urban distinction. Remedying rural segregation has proven to be less difficult than remedying urban segregation. (See Cohen 1974.)

(A number of sources are available which review school desegregation cases. Read 1975 provides a compact summary of cases from *Brown* to the present with some attention to social processes related to the cases. Levin and Moise 1975, in the same volume, instead of dividing the set of cases into four periods as Read does, discuss the issue in terms of legal questions. Carter 1955 lists pre-1955 cases which culminated in *Brown*. Blaustein and Ferguson, Jr. 1957 provide a description, for a general audience, of the "segregation cases," their legal background, and the parties involved. Peltason 1961 describes the plight of the judges of the lower federal courts upon whom the most pressure was put in the early implementation of *Brown*. Orfield 1969a,b; 1975, although focusing primarily on the legislative and executive branches, provides information on their points of contact with the actions of the judiciary—information often omitted in "cases"accounts.)

III. 1.c. School Desegregation in the North and West—De Facto Segregation. *Keyes* v. *School District No. 1* (referred to as the Denver case) was the first non-Southern case to come before the Court. It was also the first case that clearly did not involve segregation mandated or permitted by state statute. De jure versus de facto segregation is a distinction popularly associated with desegregation cases. There continues to be the idea that segregation as mandated by racially explicit state laws can be and is distinct from segregation which occurs "naturally" or non-deliberately as a result of fortuitous social factors such as residential segregation. De facto segregation was thought to be immune from legal action requiring desegregation. (See, for example, Feldstein and Mackler 1969 and Hyman and Newhouse 1964.) This distinction became embedded in desegregation law with the *Jefferson* cases of 1966 and 1967 (Read 1975). At first sight, the Denver case might seem to be a case of de facto versus de jure segregation. The decision, in fact, maintained the de jure-de facto distinction but included under the rubric of de jure segregation that which results from the actions of governmental officials (including both education and non-education officials). The Supreme Court's decision endorsed similar lower court policies as enunciated in the Pontiac case. These decisions decreased the number of cases which would be immune to court action as a result of being de facto (as opposed to de jure) segregation and there has yet to be a case in which the segregation has been found to be purely de facto. Actions which are taken as an indication of intent to segregate include the manipulation or gerrymandering of attendance zones to effect separatism, transfer policies which result in segregation, and the selection of school sites so as to maintain segregation of students by skin color. Disproportionate assignment of minority persons to schools disproportionately attended by minority pupils have also been considered evidence of violation of the law as is open enrollment, free transfer, and optional attendance zones which do not produce desegregation.

In the case of *Swann* v. *Charlotte-Mecklenburg County Board of Education* decided in 1971, the Court, in a much awaited decision, ruled that although the current patterns of segregation were not due to current actions of the school board, they were the result of past practices of segregation and thus had to be remedied. Those awaiting the decision hoped for a clear statement on whether "racial balance" (representation proportional to the district population in each school) would be the standard for the extent of desegregation required. The decision, however, was equivocal. Some read it to indicate that in certain cases (of proven intent to segregate) racial balance is expected unless the district can show that it is not at all practical. Others read the decision to mean that racial balance is not necessarily required. Perhaps even more significantly, the use of extensive crosstown busing was granted as a permissible remedy.

Recently, the question of the extent of Court demanded remedy has received the most intense interest. The crucial question concerns the extent of the area which must be desegregated in the event that a violation is found. The doctrine of equity law holds that the nature and extent of the remedy are determined by measuring the violation and the extent of its effects. In *Keyes*, the Court ruled that district-wide remedies were appropriate even though the segregative actions occurred only in one part of the school system. The Court held that segregation in one part of the district had consequences for other parts of the district and thus that a district-wide remedy was appropriate.

The next landmark case was the *Milliken* v. *Bradley* decision rendered by the Supreme Court in 1974. The Supreme Court found that the practice of utilizing neighborhood schools where the residential patterns were definitely segregated, that the particular locations chosen for school construction, and that optional attendance zones (which permitted segregated patterns) had produced results from which it could be inferred that there was intent to segregate. In other words, segregation found in Detroit was judged to be de jure and therefore the responsibility of school authorities to remedy. On the other hand, in what has been identified by some as a retreat in the forward battle of the courts against segregation, the Supreme Court honored the school district lines which subdivide the metropolitan area of Detroit and shifted the burden of proof to the plaintiffs to show that actions of the suburban school officials or of state education officials were based upon intent to segregate. Reversing the lower courts, the Supreme Court refused to demand an interdistrict remedy.* (The decision, however, did suggest that state responsibility for desegregation might later become more emphasized.)

(Read 1975 and Levin and Moise 1975 provide reviews. Levin and Moise specifically focus upon the 1970's. Both articles also include short sections on the segregation of Hispano-Americans. Flannery 1972 provides explicit descriptions of actions considered to show intent to segregate. Abrams 1975 discusses violations in the Boston case. Chachkin 1972, an NAACP staff attorney, argues for metropolitan desegregation.)

III. 1.d. School Finance Cases. One of the grounds upon which the Supreme Court objected to apartheid schooling was the denial of equal educational opportunity. The national impetus to desegregate schools was closely tied to, and to some extent overshadowed by, the goal of equal educational opportunity (see Section II and IV). Cases involving components of equal educational opportunity other than racial composition have been brought before the courts as well. One of these areas which has been linked to the question of inequitable schooling for black children, particularly those from lower-income families, has to do with methods of school finance. The current method of school finance through property taxes is considered by some to be a structural means of discrimination against minorities.

The concern focuses upon the great differences that exist among school districts in per pupil expenditure. These differentials are linked to district wealth as measured by the value of property in the district. Districts with low property value must tax at a higher rate to get comparable tax revenues or settle for lower rates of per pupil expenditure. It is argued that differentials in district wealth produce differences in school expenditures affecting the efficiency and effectiveness of the schools. Poorer schools supposedly provide fewer social and economic benefits.

As with other reforms undertaken in the pursuit of equal opportunity, the concept of equity in school finance reforms has undergone a series of redefinitions and reorientations. In some of the intial cases which were rejected by the courts, the argument was phrased in terms of pupils' educational needs, a judicially unmanageable standard. Coons, et al. (1970) proposed an alternative standard or basis for remediation of interdistrict resource inequality, "fiscal neutrality", whereby the correlation between district wealth and per pupil expenditure would be eliminated. Fiscal neutrality was seen as a step in the direction of eliminating inequality in education for poor children.

The best known court cases connected with school finance are *Serrano* v. *Priest* ruled upon by the California Supreme Court in 1971 and *San Antonio Independent School District* v. *Rodriquez*, the first "fiscal neutrality" case to reach the United States Supreme Court. In *Serrano* v. *Priest*, the California Supreme Court accepted the "fiscal neutrality" approach as standard. The Supreme Court, in 1973, however, reversed the lower court decision in the case of *San Antonio Independent School District* v. *Rodriquez*, ruling that the Texas method of school finance (largely based upon property tax) did not violate the equal protection clause of the constitution. The majority opinion was that the methods of finance are in need of reform, but that reform should be undertaken by lawmakers. State constitutions such as that in California do, in some cases, provide for "thorough and efficient" or "thorough and uniform" education thus making "fiscal neutrality" approaches more appropriate than property tax methods in meeting the legal requirements of the state.

---

*It is interesting to note that there is some element of fairness arising in the popular response to the question of metropolitan desegregation. Those making policy demanding urban desegregation are viewed as sending their children to private schools or as living in suburban districts untouched by the decisions. In a documentary on busing televised by CBS on May 29, 1976, Edward Kennedy was shown talking with residents of a Boston neighborhood disrupted by violence concerning busing. One of the residents comments could be overheard. He was telling Kennedy, "Bus your kids, Teddy. Bus your kids." Another example of this thinking is given in Taylor 1973:343, which makes reference to "limousine liberals", the middle- and upper-class individuals who look down at working class prejudices and call for desegregation while remaining ensconced in their homogeneous suburbs.

Aside from analyses of the implications of school finance reform litigation and legislation, there have also been efforts to show that those who are affected by district poverty are often poor minority students. Spratlen (1973), for example, using data such as that provided in the Hobson report on Washington, D.C. schools attempts to show color disparity in terms of the greater economic disadvantage to inner city districts which have high proportions of black students. (See Coons, et al. 1970 for an alternative position—to which Spratlen 1973 objects.) Others dispute the assumption that poor districts necessarily have poor students and that students will benefit from a strict policy of fiscal neutrality. (See Cohen 1974 and Levin 1974, for example.) Cohen includes conclusions from Coleman, et al. (1966) and Jencks, et al. (1972) which contradict arguments given in court that fiscal inputs are related to educational achievement and future life chances. (See Section IV.2.)

Background information and discussions of the implications of the school finance reform movement are presented in Pincus (1974); Kirp (1973) discusses background of early school finance cases. (See also Coons, et al. 1970 for evolution of the fiscal neutrality approach.)

III. 1.e. The Courts and Second-Generation Problems. As the standards for desegregation evolved, figures indicating the social-race compositions of the district's schools became the usual criterion for ascertaining compliance with the law. At first, these compositions were considered on the basis of schools as a whole; however, it soon became evident that there were methods for intra-school discrimination which maintained separation of the children within the buildings. These methods of intra-school segregation are in a sense "second-generation" problems. One method is called tracking, streaming, or ability grouping whereby children of similar abilities or background are placed in the same class (often on the basis of standardized IQ tests). In the *Hobson* v. *Hansen* case, the plaintiff won. The decision rendered was that the tracking system used in the District of Columbia schools was unconstitutional because the method of student classification or assignment to tracks was biased. The decision is not a clear precedent, however, as the circuit court, on appeal, decided only that the type of tracking used in the District schools was invalid. The invalidity of all tracking systems was not enunciated.

Another second generation problem has to do with the disproportionate amount of suspensions and expulsions of black versus white students. In the *Hawkins* v. *Coleman* case decided in 1974, the court found that black students in Dallas did suffer more frequent suspensions, longer suspensions, and more corporal punishment than the white students, especially when black students constituted minorities in their schools.

These second-generation problems which have sometimes been referred to under the rubric of "resegregation" have not been definitively responded to by the courts. They, along with questions concerning inter-district remedies, constitute some of the legal unknowns concerning court involvement in school desegregation.

(See Section V.5 for further discussion of these methods of resegregation. See also Kirp and Yudof 1974 for a description of relevant cases as well as Levin and Moise 1975 who discuss the problem of separating, ascertaining, and verifying the educational utility of tracking versus the intent of the practice to segregate—as well as other complications of second generation problems. One problem depends upon the validity of the classification procedures some of which, e.g., standardized intelligence tests, are also under fire. Flannery 1972 also provides a discussion of second generation problems.)

III. 1.f. Private School Cases. In a sense, private schools are a second generation problem that has arisen in the course of attempts to circumvent desegregation. Initial efforts to forestall desegregation on the part of Southern legislatures included the tactic of providing tuition grants directly and indirectly to private institutions which were segregated. Cases concerning such devices were brought to court. One of the best known cases is *Griffin* v. *County School Board of Prince Edward County* which was decided in 1964. In 1959, the supervisors of Prince Edward County, Virginia, refused to levy taxes for schools. The public schools did not open in the fall of 1959 and remained closed until the year of the case. Private schools were established for white students with support from the state via a tuition plan. (See Orfield 1969b for a description of the political context of the contested practices.) These attempts of the states to support segregated private schools were ruled unconstitutional.

The question of whether private schools may bar individuals on the basis of color without violating the Civil Rights Act or the Constitution has also been debated. A recent case on this question has been brought to the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals from eastern Virginia where the district court ruled the discrimination a violation of the 1966 Civil Rights Act.

A means more effective than court decisions for preventing private schools from formal segregation is found in laws providing that tax-exemptions permitted to private schools and for doners' contributions are not allowed in the case of segregated private schools. The 1974 report (Volume III) of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1975), in reviewing civil rights enforcement practices, criticizes the Internal Revenue Service administrators for their very narrow interpretation of the law. (The Commission report provides a thorough description of IRS's responsibilities, data collection procedures, and enforcement efforts.)

(See Kirp and Yudof 1974 for description of the various cases. Champagne 1973 also describes some of the cases, avoidance techniques, and some early data on the spread of private schools. See Section V. 2.b. for further information on private schools.

III. 2. Legislation

III. 2.a. The Role of Congress and the President in School Desegregation. The *Brown* decision required massive efforts for implementation. In 1954, the task of establishing administrative and enforcement machinery and the fleshing out of policy still lay ahead. Many of these tasks were ones appropriately taken up by Congress and the president in the event of default on the local level. Until 1964, the role of Congress and the president had been limited to situations such as the provision of federal troops by President Eisenhower to stop Governor Faubus and proclamations issued by President Kennedy in support of court ordered action. In 1964, President Johnson signed into law the Civil Rights Act which provided an expanded role for federal agencies in encouraging and enforcing school desegregation.

Congress and presidents working with Congress have relied primarily upon three means of promoting school desegregation: 1. laws regulating the activity of federal agencies in dispensing funds; 2. establishment of administrative machinery for review and enforcement; and 3. allocation of funds to assist in desegregation-related problems.

The employment of these measures has not been uniform. As mentioned above, the courts carried most of the burdens of implementing school desegregation, especially in the first ten years following the 1954 decision. With the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, some of the resources of the Department of HEW and the Justice Department were brought to bear on school desegregation. Those mechanisms, however, have been less utilized since 1968-69 when the efforts of Congress and the President turned to struggles over limiting the roles of HEW and the Justice Department in utilizing the powers originally established in the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

A more diffuse influence of Congressional and Executive activity upon school desegregation has been suggested by Orfield (1975). Busing has attracted a great deal of political attention in the last five years. Desegregation has become associated primarily with the portrayals constantly reiterated and reinforced by anti-busing congressmen and presidents. Instead of leaders serving to inspire the country during a difficult period of social and cultural change, the late 1960's and 1970's have seen an emphasis upon negative aspects of those changes. To some degree, the fears and negative views of particular segments of the population have been championed in the public arena. (See Section II for more on particular viewpoints.) Instead of focusing upon positive outcomes, "forced busing" has become a political focus encouraging the public to question the legitimacy of court orders. The primary burden of implementing Brown has been passed back to the courts.

(For reference on specific areas, see Section III. 2.b. and III. 2.c. For detailed descriptions of the Congressional role see Orfield 1969b, 1975.)

III. 2.b. Civil Rights Legislation and School Desegregation. Federal agencies have traditionally had a limited role in education as compared to local and state governments. The expansion of that role was strongly contested in Congress especially by powerful Southern Congressmen and Senators. The 1954 decision by the Supreme Court meant that a number of school systems were operating illegally yet federal money continued to flow to those illegal systems. Efforts by Congressman Adam Clayton Powell to amend appropriations so that this support could no longer be supplied were defeated time after time. Not until 1964 when the crest of national support for civil rights was at its height was it possible to get a restrictive provision through Congress. That legislation, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, began what has been called the "administrative era" of school desegregation.

Some of the important aspects of the 1964 Civil Rights Act include the following: Title IV of the Act required the Commissioner of HEW to make technical assistance available to local school boards which were in the process of preparing school desegregation plans. Title IV authorized the Attorney General to bring desegregation suits on behalf of potential plaintiffs who otherwise had no recourse to sue on their own behalf, thus making available the resources of the Department of Justice for desegregation litigation.

Laying the groundwork for an enforcement device which was quite effective, Title VI proscribed discrimination in any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance, under threat of loss of funding. The act ordered that:

> No person in the United States shall on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program of activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

Title VI provided an impetus for the establishment of offices within HEW charged with determining compliance of school districts applying for federal funds.

The Act brought an expansion of HEW. Prior to 1964, the Office of Education was fairly powerless (see Kirp and Yudof 1974: 328). The process of preparing for enforcement was difficult as was the development of guidelines, given strong pressures from both civil rights groups and local officials. At one point, one of the chief consultants, George Foster (1965), resorted to writing an unofficial article in the *Saturday Review* as a means of communicating what seemed to be developing agency guidelines on standards.

Since most of the administrative machinery of the American educational system is located at state and local levels, the method of withholding funds was practically the only enforcement mechanism that could be wielded by the federal government. The threat of denial of funds was effective and brought about much faster compliance than the case-by-case method of the court process. Orfield (1975:85) points out that more black students attended desegregated schools in the first year of enforcement of the 1964 Civil Rights Act than during the previous ten years. There were drawbacks, however. In some cases, the elimination of federal support meant the elimination of programs designed to help those whom desegregation was supposed to aid. The method also opened the agency to political attacks.

After the height of effort in the mid 1960's congressional and executive support for school desegregation waned. Efforts to limit administrative enforcement activity have been debated in Congress annually since 1966. Desegregation was an issue in the 1968 Presidential election. When Nixon took office in 1968, he reversed the trend toward strict enforcement. The resouces were disengaged and officials were encouraged by Nixon and by pressure from some members of Congress not to press for enforcement. In Congress there continued to be efforts to limit the conditions under which HEW could withhold or cut off funds. The Justice Department's prodesegregation stand was diverted and, in fact, the Department was used in the service of those desiring to delay desegregation. Justice lawyers went to the Supreme Court in the *Alexander* v. *Holmes* case to request a delay in the desegregation order.

Enforcement procedures became highly politicized by Nixon (Orfield 1969a, b) and the aura of inevitability of desegregation which had begun to develop in the 1960's dissipated. Although the first statement in statutory law of any affirmative duty to desegregate appeared in the 1974 education bill extending the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, that bill contained little in the way of measures to promote desegregation. Its formulation had taken place in a heated struggle over the anti-busing amendments which, if they had not been defeated, would have limited actions which could be ordered by the courts. Those amendments were only narrowly defeated.

(For description of the development of the administrative staff and procedures up through the late 1960's, see Orfield 1969b. For criticisms of the enforcement procedures, see Southern Regional Council 1969 and the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights reports, especially 1975.)

III. 2.c Federal aid to education. In 1965, Congress enacted the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The bill, a $1.3 billion measure, was the first significant piece of federal legislation in the area of general aid to education in the nation's history. Historically, the Federal government has played a limited role in education finance. The act provided a number of basic education programs, channeling a good deal of money into public schools serving low-income students. These funds were important sources of revenue especially during a period in which per pupil expenditures were rising even faster than the cost of living. Together with the provision for delaying and eliminating funding to segregated districts passed in the 1964 Civil Rights Act, ESEA provided powerful inducements to desegregate. State departments of education expanded through ESEA funds and became more dependent on federal funds (Campbell and Layton 1968).

As referred to above, the fight in Congress over the extension of ESEA programs provided an area for a terrific struggle over the future of desegregation. President Nixon and a good number of senators and respresentatives pushed strongly for anti-busing proposals to be written into the extnesions. The bill was finally passed and signed by Nixon's successor, Ford, in spite of its lack of stringent antibusing requirements.

In addition to preventing the inclusion of stringent anti-busing provisions, the civil rights advocates in Congress did manage to secure some support for desegregation. The bill contained the first statement in statutory law of any affirmative duty to desegregate. It also forbade gerrymandering for the purpose of segregation.

The anti-busing anti-desegregation forces, on the other hand, won some concessions from or managed to neutralize some of the foreward momentum of the desegregation measures. In the past the school boards continued to be liable to further court suits as new legal developments occured or as population shifts resulted in non-compliance with guidelines. The education bill signed into law in 1974 made it possible for a presiding judge to declare a case closed—in other words, to declare that all vestiges of de jure segregation had been eliminated and, thus, that the court had no further jurisdiction over the school board. Intentional segregation would be liable to prosecution, but changes brought about through population shift would be ignored, thus allowing resegregation.

To date, the efforts to curb busing as a means of desegregation have not been successful. The anti-desegregationists, however, did manage to limit the courts and HEW enforcement practices by prohibiting the courts and HEW from requiring mid-year pupil transfer to effect desegregation. Further, the procedure and the time period preceding the cut-off of funds was lengthened. HEW was also forbidden to order a school system to implement a plan requiring "extensive" busing. Although this may not be binding upon HEW since HEW does not order the implementation of any plan, it can be and has been cited by an HEW official as a reason for failure to demand compliance.

Federal aid to education also played another role in school desegregation. In the late sixties, when the courts had ordered immediate, massive desegregation in areas of the South, Nixon promised to provide federal money to aid in the transition. This was done in the form of the Emergency School Assistance Program (ESAP). Congress approved immediate dispersal of seventy-five million dollars through existing programs. Because of the pressure for haste, applications were not carefully scrutinized and, as a result, money was not always spent on desegregation-related costs. In fact, the money was more-or-less given away which may have eased some of the pain felt by segregationists over losing the battle against desegregation. Over two periods of extension and struggle of the emergency program, it was shaped into a less amorphous program with standards that did provide some incentives for desegregation.

(See Eidenberg and Morey 1969 and Meranto 1967 for detailed descriptions of passage of the 1965 ESEA. See Orfield 1975 for brief descriptions of the passage of the initial ESEA and ESAP appropriations. A more extended coverage of the 1974 Congressional struggle over ESEA is given in Section VI of Hillson, et al. 1969 who provide some early examples of how educators conceptualized the purpose of the federal money made available to the districts. An evaluation study of ESAP is presented in Crain 1973. See Campbell 1967 for a description of the then contemporary conceptualization of federal entry into education. Campbell and Layton 1968 provide a brief analysis of the extent and impact of federal entry. For evaluation of compliance of districts receiving Title I ESEA funds with program requirements, see Southern Center for Studies in Public Policy and the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund 1969 and National Advisory Council on the Education of the Disadvantaged Children 1967; for a similary evaluation of federally funded Indian education programs see NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund 1971.)

III. 3. Civil Rights Organizations and the Genesis and Implementation of School Desegregation

Elimination of intentional segregation has proceeded as a result of voluntary effort, implementation of court ordered desegregation, and induced compliance wherein districts were threatened with loss of funds. The federal courts cannot bring suits, thus, it was left to private citizens and voluntary groups to sue for relief if the local authorities were resistant. In order to gain their constitutional rights, private citizens, with the support of some civil rights group such as the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, brought suit against school officials. Private citizens and groups were relieved of the burden to any great extent only during the short period when the federal systems set up to effect desegregation were being supported by the president and Congress during the mid 1960's.

Two crucial aspects of federal agency pressure were the passage of legislation, the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and the establishment of enforcement machinery and guidelines authorized by the act. The passage of the Civil Rights Act with a powerful enforcer, Title VI, had been pushed in Congress by Representative Adam Clayton Powell since the 1950's, but always blocked by Southern segregationists. Federal money continued to go to support illegal systems. As late as early 1963, President Kennedy saw no possibility that a Title VI type provision could be passed. The Civil Rights Movement, with its sit-ins and demonstrations was, however, during that period bringing black oppression to televisions and newspapers across the country. The local white police reaction to the Birmingham demonstration organized by Martin Luther King, Jr., symbolized and gave meaning to the black struggle in the South. Confrontation with a clear symbolic portrayal of white oppression on blacks crystalized national opinion for civil rights and against Southern apartheid.

The three major direct action Civil Rights organizations, CORE, SCLC, and SNCC, which had been formed in the 1940's and 1950's expanded enormously. Besides the demonstrations that garnered national support for the Civil Rights Act, voluntary civil rights groups also had influence in helping to establish the momentum for HEW enforcement policies. The NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund joined together with AFSC (the American Friends Service Committee) to form a Task Force which helped spread information to communities and put pressure on the Office of Education (OE) to establish meaningful guidelines. The Task Force, SNCC, and other civil rights groups monitored enforcement activities and encouraged OE not to submit totally to the desires of local school persons in the South.

In the late 1960's, some of the action-oriented civil rights groups, such as CORE, became more militant, rejecting integration as irrelevant. The remarks of leaders of these groups and the riots that were occurring in Watts, Detroit, and other larger cities provided a new symbolization of black hopes which frightened whites. As a result, national support for desegregation measures which had been strong during the King era lessened.

(Adams and Burke 1970 provide an encyclopedia-like description of people, organizations, and events involved in the Civil Rights Movement. Positions of some of the civil rights advocates are available in the transcription of a national forum included in Howe, et al. 1970. For examples of reports of enforcement activities and the misuse of federal funds see Southern Center for Studies in Public Policy and the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund 1969; NAACP LD and EF 1971; and Rodgers and Bullock 1972. The Southern Regional Council, a civil rights research group funded by foundations, also has provided a monitoring function as has the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. See reports issued by the Southern Regional Council, Inc. 1969, such as the "Special Report: The Federal Retreat in School Desegregation," which describe the general trends in enforcement, the techniques utilized, and the politicization of the process. Particular cases are described in some detail. U.S. Commission on Civil Rights reports may be obtained through ERIC.)

III. 4. Role of Social Science Research in the Desegregation Process

There are two areas in which applied research on social problems has played a role in the process of desegregation. The more questioned has been the use of social science data in court cases. The famous footnote eleven in the Supreme Court's *Brown* decision cites evidence amassed by the psychologist Kenneth Clark and others which pointed to the psychological harm rendered black children by the *Plessy* doctrine of separate but equal. The role of this extra-legal evidence in court cases continues to be debated. Clark has argued the importance of social science data in establishing the link between segregation and inequality while others have denied it. (See, for example, Clark's 1959 response to Cahn 1955; see also Van den Haag 1960 who denies the importance of the Clark data.)

Probably the most frequent counter argument is that the decision was based on societal norms suggested in the Constitution which forbid differential privileges regardless of whether lack of access to the privileges has an adverse effect. (For a discussion relevant to this issue see Kirp and Yudof 1974:297-299.)

Judge Wisdom (1975) in reviewing the opinions of others on the admissibility of social science evidence concludes that courts primarily use social science evidence to lend a factual and scientific aura to a result sustainable on other bases. (See also Levin and Moise 1975.) He argues that in thinking about cases judges commonly use assumptions similar to hypotheses presented in sociological journals which may or may not be explicitly researched. Craven (1975:156) summarizes a similar point:

> Just as a raconteur will seldom let the facts interfere with a good story, judges seem to have seldom allowed sociology to interfere with a good theory—until the time of a new idea has come. Sometimes it is a long time coming; but when it arrives, it is then woven into the constitution fabric.

Aside from the original *Brown* decision, social science data as such have been admitted in desegregation cases to show that various policies resulted in segregated schools. It has also been admitted in the important area of devising remedial measures. Pettigrew, for example, has been called to testify in cases where remedies have been protested because of the possibility of provoking "white flight." Pettigrew (1972) has testified regarding his research that the black-white ratio affects educational achievement and that without sufficient numbers of whites desegregation may have negligible effects on black educational achievement. Some courts reject this information on the basis of legal precedent which says probable resistance should not prevent protection offered by the 14th amendment (see Craven 1975).

Glazer, in the foreward to Kirp and Yudof (1974), suggests that the "marriage" of law and social science has occurred and will continue because legal questions involving policy necessarily involve questions of effect which the courts are not accustomed to predicting. The role of social science in court cases, however, is not yet firmly established. Some jurors, as cited above, consider such data to constitute supporting evidence only, others consider research as irrelevant to the legal questions involved, and others as contributing more to confusion than clarification. In any event, individuals in the judiciary are probably, at the least, affected by social science research indirectly to the extent that findings become "common knowledge."

The second area in which social science research has had a major impact upon desegregation has been in assessing causes and evaluating educational programs. These studies have included extensive research such as that undertaken by Coleman, et al. (1966) to ascertain the major determinants of inequality and evaluation research of the remedial programs undertaken by the federal government, particularly "compensatory education" programs and the educational outcomes of desegregation itself. The legitimacy of this use of social science is not questioned, but to some degree the susceptibility of social science findings to political manipulation is. Research on educational outcomes, for example, in what have been called desegregated settings, do not readily support the notion that simple desegregation will improve educational outcomes for black children (see Section VI). These findings along with other studies purporting to show other factors as influencing black outcomes, it is sometimes suggested, have provided a rationale for those who wish to muffle efforts to desegregate the North and West as well as the urban areas of the South.

Concerning such studies, particularly those undertaken by Jensen (1969) and Jencks, et al. (1972), Clark (1973:78) points out:

> All of the more publicized social science research and theories—and the acceleration of concern of social science with problems which have direct educational policy implications—came in the wake of the Brown decision, and became part of the political controversy surrounding the desirability, the methods, and the rate of public school desegregation.

Clark goes on to suggest that much of the research and many of the theories which proliferated in the post-Brown era did not focus upon the social science findings cited by the Court in *Brown*, but rather postulated other reasons for the academic and psychological inferiority of black students. Some of these emphases such as genetic inferiority would, of course, have implications counter to *Brown* and were in fact cited in some court cases as reasons for opposing or disregarding the implications of the Supreme Court decision.

Clark's analysis places the desegregation research subsequent to *Brown* in political relief. He is not the only author to suggest political motivations behind the support of researchers pursuing determinants other than discrimination. (see Edmonds, et al. 1973, for example.) An early essay by Long (1955) argued that the criteria for choice of desegregation research should be derived consistent with the spirit of *Brown*.

Long's article is interesting not only because it points out the politically charged nature of desegregation research at an early stage, but also because it provides an argument that black social scientists would be more likely to ask questions appropriate to the Supreme Court mandate of elimination of apartheid schooling than would white researchers. An assertion which became popular especially in the late 1960's was that social scientists, educators, and program developers who were white were not appropriate as students of or administrators of programs and policies developed to alleviate the problems of low-income, black, or other minority individuals and groups. A strand of this ideology is suggested by Long (1955:205) in the following:

> The orientation of Negro and white educators and social scientists is doubtlessly somewhat different; one group accepting and being motivated by the equalitarian ideology, and the other accepting the ideology with qualifications based upon status considerations, expediencies and tradition. . . . There appears to be an inclination for Negro spokesman to under-estimate the difficulties of change and for the white "liberals", including educators and social scientists, to over-emphasize the difficulties.

Both Long and Clark, and of course many others, recognize the importance of research findings as a medium of debate in policy formation. While some, however, would argue that because of the social and political structure only a limited number of questions are asked, others discuss the manner in which findings feed back on policy. Cohen and Garet (1975) explain the impact of research findings not as impinging in a logical way on policy and program development but rather as entering into the general body of knowledge and beliefs upon which social policy is based. Long (1955) presents the same argument in terms of black-white relations, arguing that research plays an important role in the integrating and socializing relationships between blacks and whites.

Published descriptions of the conditions of the potential recipients of social policies have played an important role in this area. Some of these works became general reading as well, communicating to the public at large some of the same images which were helping to form the social policy from which programs would be generated. Some publications in this tradition are Conant (1961) who focused upon the problems faced by urban schools and Clark's (1965) *Dark Ghetto* which provided a description, often in the words of inhabitants of Harlem, of what life is like under impoverished conditions. Portraits vary as to what aspect of the problem they reveal. Riessman (1962) contains descriptions of the child for whom compensatory education programs were devised while the observational field studies of Rosenfeld (1971) and Rist (1973), for example, present in compelling form structural aspects of urban schools which doom some students to failure.

Probably the greatest impact of social science research on desegregation policy has come from the study reported in Coleman, et al. (1966) and the subsequent analyses and reanalyses of Coleman's school and achievement data. Social scientists, especially nationally known ones such as Moynihan (1969) attribute the Coleman data with shaping conceptualizations of equal education opportunity and with affecting the course of desegregation policy by destroying some widely held beliefs about why black children do poorly in school. These arguments are reviewed in Sections II.2. and IV. Desegregation-related research has in some cases supported or reinforced certain visions of society while in others it has called into question certain tenets of such world views (see Jencks, et al. 1972). The policy of compensatory education, for example, which emerged during the era of the War on Poverty provided the charter upon which a number of educational programs such as Head Start and Follow Through were undertaken by the Government. Adherence to that frame of reference has been undermined, Cohen and Garet (1975) suggest, by evaluation research on the early intervention programs such as Head Start which are counter to the predicted results. As a result, there is decreasing confidence in the previously widely accepted importance attributed to early intervention and to methods designed to stimulate early conceptual development. The assumptions upon which the policy rests have been undercut and support for the programs has decreased even though the programs are politically popular and the next logical step would be to expand them to all eligible children. Whether a covert policy has produced these findings or the findings have affected policy is an issue under debate.

An interesting sideline to the role of research in desegregation is the clash among social science disciplines in the methodologies and analytic approaches which have been highlighted. (See, for example, controversies concerning Coleman's analysis of the 1966 data referred to in Section IV.) Government money has gone to support a great deal of desegregation research which has stimulated the interests and efforts of researchers from many fields thus providing another arena for conflict: the favorite methods and variables of different disciplines. This interplay has brought changing emphasis in the research so that some of the research questions have been reformulated. The onslaught, for example, on the validity of standardized intelligence tests as a means of classifying students has raised questions concerning the advisability of the use of standardized tests as the primary measures for assessing educational outcome as affected by desegregation and compensatory education programs.

The use of social science research in court cases may have also had an interesting outcome, that of encouraging what Rivlin (1973) has referred to as "forensic social science" wherein the traditional posture of objectivity and impartiality on the part of the social scientist is abandoned in favor of a very clearly stated position for or against a particular policy. The best case possible is made with the notion in mind that another scholar or team of scholars will undertake to demolish the case with counter evidence. Rivlin cites as a clear example, Guthrie, et al. (1971) and also suggests that Jencks, et al. (1972) would fall into a similar genre.

(In addition to the above, see Cohen and Garet 1975 for a critical assessment of the accustomed manner in which applied research, particularly evaluation research, is viewed by consumers and researchers alike. They give figures on the increase in federal spending on evaluation of educational programs—evaluation following the government's venture into educational programming. For a general description of evaluation in federal agencies, see Wholey, et al. 1970. Pettigrew 1972 provides an example of policy decisions based on research.)

IV. EXTENT AND CAUSES OF EDUCATIONAL INEQUALITY

Since the 1930's, psychologists have postulated that the social stigma attached to being black produced a negative self-concept. Clark and Clark (1950), for example, demonstrated that both black and white children preferred white dolls over black dolls and associated more positive character traits with white dolls. In the 1954 Supreme Court decision, Clark's research was cited in support of the argument that segregated schools are inherently unequal. Schools segregated by force of law stigmatize those who are restricted to certain schools.

Since the *Brown* decision, the conceptualization of the consequences of segregation and of equal education opportunity have undergone a number of re-definitions. This section is arranged to reflect the sequence of development of different emphases in research and educational thinking.

IV. 1. Color Isolation in Schools

Initially segregation, or the stigmatizing purposive separation of black children from whites, was considered to constitute a lack of unequal education opportunity for black children. Segregation was translated into a judicially manageable and sociologically measurable concept by defining it as color isolation or the physical separation of black and white children in different schools. The nuance of stigmatization in some sense was lost and color isolation became a research focus.

A large amount of material describing the extent of color isolation in U. S. schools exists. Much of this material might be placed in the category of "progress reports" or evaluations of the degree of desegregation which has (not) occurred in the public schools in a particular area. (For examples see Clark 1962; Alexander 1963; Gibson, et al. 1963; Rose 1964; Walker, et al. 1967; Alabama Council on Human Relations 1972; Clark 1972a,b; and Hope 1975.)

The most comprehensive documentation of isolation was undertaken by a team headed by James Coleman. The nationwide survey was mandated by the 1964 Civil Rights Act, apparently to document the lack of availability of equal educational opportunity. The project, the second largest social science project in history, involved the testing of over half a million individuals and the gathering of data from some 4,000 schools. The report, the *Equality of Educational Opportunity* Report, commonly known as the Coleman Report, was submitted to Congress in 1966. (See Coleman, et al. 1966 and Mosteller and Moynihan 1972.)

The Coleman report revealed that most American school children were in schools where children of their own color constituted a large proportion of the student body. Eighty percent of all first grade white students, for example, were in such schools while sixty-five per cent of all first grade black students were in such schools.

A second large report, *Racial Isolation in the Public Schools*, was the product of a study conducted by the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights (1967b), its mandate being to focus upon segregation resulting from circumstances other than legal compulsion. Within this constraint, primary attention was given to the cities and metropolitan areas. The findings of this study were that national and regional averages underestimated school segregation in the metropolitan areas where two-thirds of the black and two-thirds of the white population then lived. On the basis of their study the researchers concluded that color isolation in city schools is intense regardless of the size of the city and whether it is located in the North or South. Secondly, they concluded that the problem is increasing. Demographic trends beginning some sixty years ago had resulted in an increasing concentration of black people in the central cities with whites more heavily populating the suburban rings around the cities. These trends were associated by the authors of the report with the patterns of isolation found in the schools:

> The rich variety of the Nation's urban population is being separated into distinct groups, living increasingly in isolation from each other. In metropolitan areas there is a growing separation between the poor and the affluent, between the well educated and the poorly educated, between Negroes and whites. The racial, economic, and social stratification of cities and suburbs is reflected in similar stratification in city and suburban school districts. (1967b:17)

It is a general consensus that residential segregation in urban areas impedes school integration. This segregation occurs within the central city as well as between cities and their suburbs. Coleman (1975), on the basis of data on trends in school segregation between 1968-1973, suggests that while intra- or within-district segregation has decreased, inter- or between-district segregation has increased. The increase in between-district segregation is associated with white migration to the suburbs, a trend originally labeled "white flight" because it was believed to be associated with desegregation. The extent to which "white flight" is a result of school desegregation is a current source of research and debate. Given the current dominant perspective regarding school desegregation (that the presence of whites is essential to attainment of positive gains for blacks), the trend of white flight has important implications for policy formation.

(The debate over the causes of white flight has been stimulated by Coleman, et al.'s n.d. report on trends in school segregation, 1968-1973. Coleman attributes white flight to school desegregation especially where blacks constitute a large proportion of the population. His argument is contested in Green and Pettigrew 1976 and Farley 1976. See also Rist and Orfield 1976 and Coleman 1976. See Section V.2.e for further discussion of this topic.)

IV. 2. School Facilities

Underlying the conviction that segregated black students were systematically denied equal education opportunity was the assumption that black schools had poorer facilities than white schools. Black schools were imagined to be over-crowded, dilapidated, as having shorter terms, fewer textbooks, fewer and less qualified teachers, fewer courses, and so forth. The implicit belief held by some was that these restricted facilities could account for black-white differences in education. Perhaps as a result of the use of the courts as the vehicle of change, the notion of facilities was translated into per pupil expenditure. The expectation of differences in facilities, then, especially as they applied to the Southern schools, was that blacks were provided with inferior schools as measured by funds allocated.

These assumptions were strongly challenged by an important piece of government-sponsored research designed and reported upon by Coleman, et al. (1966). The Coleman study was a nationwide survey of segregated and desegregated school facilities and student achievement. The data from the survey have been analyzed and reanalyzed by groups such as that formed at Harvard and funded by the Carnegie Corporation (Mosteller and Moynihan 1972). The data have had a major impact on conceptualizations of desegregation and educational inequality.

The purpose of the survey was only vaguely described in the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The objectives which eventually evolved were: 1) to provide a description of differences in educational outcomes for six different groups (including black and white students), 2) to describe the resource inputs for six different groups, and 3) to examine the effects of various inputs on achievement.

The findings of the study did support the existence of differences between blacks and whites in educational outcomes. They did not, however, support the belief that there were marked differences between blacks and whites in terms of school facilities. In the various regions of the country, the level of school facilities of the black versus the white students were found to be roughly equivalent.* The physical facilities, the formal curricula, and most of the measurable characteristics of teachers in black and white schools were similar.

Secondly, the findings were strongly counter to received wisdom in that when family and peer group characteristics were held constant shcool facilities explained relatively little of the differences in achievement. Contrary to popular impression, differences between black and white schools' physical facilities, formal curricula, and teacher characteristics (as they were measured in the study) were very small. The small differences that did exist between schools did not relate to the achievement of students in the school. Differences were in the directions expected, but the amount of difference explained was practically negligible.

The Coleman study has been subjected to intense criticisms as might be expected of a study of such magnitude and importance. The criticisms which have been given most attention were primarily from researchers critical of the research methods. The criticisms of the Coleman study have been placed into four categories by the editors of a Harvard Educational Review (1969) issue which was devoted to further analysis and discussion of the EEO data:

(1) Alleged flaws in the design of the study (for example, a weak set of attitude questions).

(2) Difficulties in the execution of the survey which may have affected the results (for example, the refusal of a substantial number of school systems to cooperate).

(3) Alleged shortcomings in the analysis of the data (for example, the decision to control for the child's social class before examining the influence of the school on his achievement).

---

*There were differences between regions with the South having less adequate facilities in general than other regions. At that time, half of the black population was located in the South.

(4) Limitations of a survey taken at one point in time as a basis for forecasting the sustained effects of the changes in the educational system (for example, the effect of school integration).

(See Moynihan 1969 for a description of reactions to the Coleman report from the "research, education, and reform establishments.")

The general impact of the Coleman study with regard to school facilities seems to have shifted attention away from facilities as an explanation of differences between black and white educational outcomes and toward examination of non-school factors to explain these differences. Arguments as to the necessity for equal facilities, however, have continued. The present controversy concerning lack of equal financing among districts due to differences in wealth of the districts is one example. (See Section III.1.d.)

(There are numerous articles analyzing the Coleman report. Two sources are Harvard Educational Review 1969 and Mosteller and Moynihan 1972, the later produced by the group at Harvard funded to reanalyze the data. There have been further reanalyses directed to some of the same and different questions. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights' 1967b study was based upon these data as was the Jencks, et al. 1972 volume.)

IV. 3. Explanations of Unequal Educational Outcomes.

The Coleman survey may be regarded as a watershed in conceptualizations of unequal education opportunity. The research directed explicit attention to both pupil and school input as well as outcomes and their interrelationships. Previously, it was implicitly assumed that the factors affecting educational outcomes were understood and that these included school facilities and resources. When the Coleman report undercut this assumption, the point of focus in conceptualization of equal education opportunity shifted toward outcomes. Equal educational opportunity came to be associated with equal outcomes rather than equal inputs.

The Coleman study had further implications. One of the basic explanatory mechanisms connecting segregation and unequal educational outcomes, that of inferior facilities, was weakened by the Coleman study. According to the manner in which it was interpreted, the Coleman study was taken to mean that differences in schools could not account for black-white differences in performance on standardized tests. This notion that school did not have any effect on these differences spurred on those who would explain the gap in other ways.

In the survey, equality of educational opportunity was measured in terms of school inputs, including racial composition. In analyzing the effect of racial composition upon educational achievement, Coleman found that minority students in majority-white desegregated schools did somewhat better than those in non-majority-white schools, but that the difference was not large. His findings were considered, however, as indicating the importance of the social class of the student body. These findings were interpreted by Moynihan (1969:30) for example as follows:

> His report has been correctly interpreted to be the most powerful social science case for school integration that has ever been made.

According to the thinking derived, children profited from being around peers of middle- or upper-income. Since black children are inordinately lower-income, then it follows that desegregation would be beneficial to them because color desegregation would mean class desegregation. Coleman's summary of his results (quoted in Mosteller and Moynihan 1972:20, italics Coleman's) are as follows:

> Altogether, *the sources of inequality of educational opportunity appear to lie first in the home itself and the cultural influences immediately surrounding the home; then they lie in the schools' ineffectiveness to free achievement from the impact of the home, and in the schools' cultural homogeneity which perpetuates the social influences of the home and its environs.*

This perspective was compatible with an emphasis that reached its peak in the 1960's on family background as a way to explain educational outcomes. Discussed under the label of "cultural deprivation", this idea achieved a considerable degree of support.

Arguing by analogy from studies of children who had very little adult stimulation such as those locked in attics or housed in understaffed orphanages, the theory arose that lower-income children did not get proper adult stimulation during periods of conceptual and verbal development. Research contrasting lower-income living conditions and parenting styles with idealized middle- and upper-income conditions and styles found the former lacking. The federal funds made available through the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act were used to fund the development of programs to conteract this deprivation for disadvantaged students. Because many black children are products of lower-income backgrounds, the "disadvantaged" child was often thought of as a black child. To some degree, compensatory education, the rubric under which counters to deprivation came to be placed, was seen as an alternative to desegregation. If compensatory education took care of the gap between whites and blacks in educational outcomes, then why desegregate?

The cultural deprivation perspective was opposed by a number of reform-minded educators and social scientists, particularly anthropologists, who objected to the basic concept of cultural deprivation, arguing that cultural differences were being misinterpreted as cultural deficits. These arguments are similar to objections to the use of standardized tests with minority students on the grounds that they do not measure what the child has learned from his life experiences and are thus biased assessments of his ability. There have also been attempts at altering educational programs so as to make them more appropriate for the multicultural nature of the U. S. population. However, these programs, developed by educators, have not received the same widespread national attention as have the findings of Coleman, et al. (1966) and Jencks, et al. (1972).

Along with the emphasis on family and social class background as variables explaining differences in educational achievement, there was also a revival of interest in genetic explanations of group differences. The major researcher arguing this position is Jensen (1969).

The outcomes of desegregation began to be researched in earnest with regard to its effects upon educational variables (see Section VI). In a sense, however, the theoretical basis or conceptual foundation had been undercut. A number of alternative conceptualizations such as culture conflict, deprivation, and genetic inferiority—with uncertain theoretical relationships to desegregation—arose in the place of what had been a consensus in which segregation constituted the major obstacle preventing access to equal educational opportunities for blacks.

IV. 3.a. Cultural and Social Deprivation. Deprivation has been used to refer to a variety of characteristics. Gordon and Wilkerson (1966) define deprivation as a complex of characteristics: low economic status, low social status, low educational achievement, tenuous or no employment, limited participation in community organizations, and limited ready potential for upward mobility. People considered to be handicapped by this depressed social and economic status have been referred to in the literature by terms such as culturally deprived, socioeconomically deprived, educationally disadvantaged, and the like. The large body of literature that exists on the disadvantaged was developed by researchers who broadly regarded the deprived as bearers of cultural attitudes and behaviors substandard to those dominant in the broader communities they inhabit.

The "theory" of cultural deprivation, which reached its peak of acceptance in the middle and late 1960's, was based on the belief that lower-income as opposed to middle- and upper-income children tended to be exposed to insufficient stimulation which stunted their cognitive and verbal development. The children of the socially and economically deprived, it was argued, come to school disadvantaged in that their parents' culture failed to provide them with the experiences that are "normal" to the majority of school children. Primarily because of this condition, minority children were thought to show disproportionately high rates of social maladjustment, behavioral disturbance, physical disability, mental subnormality, and particularly, academic retardation. The culturally deprived child was thought to be lacking in readiness, motivation, and a learning-oriented value system. Examples of research interpreted to support this orientation are numerous. Lessor, Fifer, and Clark (1965) and Fort, Watts, and Lessor (1969) found that children of various ethnic groups differed on tests of verbal ability, reasoning, and numerical and spacial conceptualization. They believed that a lack of visual and verbal stimuli and lack of attention from parents in low-income homes led to dificits in visual, auditory, linguistic, and mnemonic abilities (see, for example, C. Deutsch 1967). Jensen (1968) found that basic learning abilities correlated highly with IQ scores for middle-class but not for lower-class students, leading him to postulate that basic abilities coupled with environmental advantages encouraged the type of conceptual development which the school requires.

A great deal of the deprivation literature concerns language acquisition. It has been suggested that children from disadvantaged backgrounds, in comparison with middle-class children, are less verbally proficient. Bloom, Davis, and Hess (1965), Gordon and Wilkerson (1966), and Osser (1973) provide summaries of the research. An early study by Pringle, Kellmer, and Tanner (1958) found differences in quantitatively measured language functions which consistently indicated that children raised in their own homes were superior to children who were raised in institutions. Interpretation of these results suggested that children raised in conditions of inadequate exposure to language would fail to fully develop linguistically. Further studies looked at the relationship between economic group status and language development. (For an early example, see Irwin 1948). These studies found that more children with what was considered retarded speech development were from lower socioeconomic groups than from upper classes. In a series of studies, Bernstein developed the hypothesis that the language of lower-class youth was characterized by a restricted form which confined their thinking. In contrast, upper-class youth tended to develop a more elaborative language which allowed greater freedom in communication (Bernstein 1961). For elaboration of these ideas, see M. Deutsch (1967b).

The concept of linguistic deprivation and associated research has been criticized by those who argue, for example, that the supporting research is severely biased because the researchers seem to lack awareness of the sociolinguistic factors affecting their results and to be ignorant of the fact that what they regard as linguistic errors are actually manifestations of rules used in alternative dialects of English. (See Labov 1970; Cazden, John, and Hymes 1972; Keddie 1973; and Cole and Scribner 1974.)

Other research has looked at how deprivation affects cognitive and social development of children (see, for example, Riessman 1962, Ausubel 1964, and Deutsch and Brown 1964). Rosen (1956) and Katz (1967), representing another line of research, looked at motivation among different social class groups.

Educational policies associated with, and resulting from the research in cultural deprivation were reflected in the general development of compensatory education programs which were primarily constructed to fulfill deficiencies in child backgrounds. While some later research has attempted to disprove or redefine basic assumptions of cultural deprivation, there has also been a growing body of criticisms of the appropriateness of compensatory education programs (Wolf and Wolf 1962, Baratz and Baratz 1970, D. Cohen 1972). (Further description of compensatory education is included in Section V. 5. c.)

(At a more global level, cultural and social deprivation theories have their counterpart in the concept of "culture of poverty." See Fuchs 1969, Leacock 1969, Harris 1975 for further references and critiques of these views as applied to minority groups in the United States.)

IV. 3.b. Genetic Inferiority. Following the Supreme Court's school desegregation decision in 1954, there was a revival of racist doctrines positing biologically based inferiority on the alleged genetic intellectual inferiority of blacks, Inferior educational outcomes for black children, the argument went, resulted from genes, not segregation.

What has been referred to as a "scientific racist" position was subsequently developed by several social scientists who looked at differences between performances on I.Q. tests by blacks versus whites (A. Coleman 1972). The bulk of this research found blacks lower in I.Q. than whites. Shuey's (1966) *The Testing of Negro Intelligence* represents the culmination of this type of research which concluded that the presence of some native differences between blacks and whites determined intelligence test results. These early studies assumed that intelligence was a fixed capacity which was distinguishable from educational achievement. This basic genetic difference was cited as one reason for the failure of the compensatory educational programs of the 1960's.

Pettigrew (1964) provides a good review of the early research on I.Q. and genetic racial differences. Davy (1973) reviews the later research, particularly focusing upon Jensen's views. Jensen (1969, 1973) remains the primary proponent of genetic differences between whites and blacks which have educational implications. Criticisms of the genetic inferiority position are numerous. For example, see Light and Smith (1969), and Brace, et al. 1971.

IV. 3.c. Biased Assessment and Negative Labeling. The cultural deprivationists tended to compare the parenting styles and community organization of lower-income people with idealized versions of middle- and upper-class styles. Linguistic characteristics and social behavior patterns of lower-income children similarly were assessed against patterns manifested by middle- and upper-income children. This dependence on a deficit view of minority patterns where divergences from middle-class norms were considered errors has decreased somewhat in the area of testing over the last few years. Primarily the arguments against standardized tests is that they are invalid with minority children owing to dissimilarities in experience. Standardized tests are normed on children whose experiences vary systematically from those of many black children; thus the content of questions and the types of testing situations, for example, tend to be inappropriate for minority children. (See Cole and Scribner 1974 for references on this subject including others by Cole and his associates. Early articles on biases in testing refer to the concept of "culture fair" tests. See Anatasi 1965. As others have argued and Cole's work demonstrates, this concept is not very meaningful.)

The biases in these tests have come under particular attack in situations where such tests are used in classification procedures. Jane Mercer's work has been important in this regard. She explored school and agency classification procedures for children based on standardized intelligence tests, and found that the procedures resulted in labeling as mentally retarded a disproportionately large number of Chicanos and blacks. She argued that current classification procedures violate the rights of children to be evaluated within a culturally appropriate normative framework, their right to be assessed as multi-dimensional beings, their right to be fully educated; their right to be free of stigmatizing labels, and their right to cultural identity and respect. (See Mercer 1974; see also Section VI. 1. a.)

Faulty assessment has also been linked to another explanation of poor performance by minority children. Research during the last ten years indicates that differing expectations of students are held by teachers and communicated perhaps unconsciously to the students. Development of thought and research in how teacher expectations influence student performance was originally stimulated by Rosenthal and Jacobson's 1968 study, *Pygmalion in the Classroom*. The basic assumption of their study was that one person's expectation for another's behavior could come to serve as a self-fulfilling prophecy (1968:174). Carried out in a public elementary school in grades 1 through 6, this study tested the hypothesis by manipulating teachers' expectations for their students' achievement to see if those expectations would be fulfilled. The manipulation, and therefore the influence on teacher expectations, was created by claiming that a general achievement test had been developed to identify late intellectual "bloomers." Children were accordingly labeled on a random basis and the results given to the teachers. At the end of a year, achievement test data offered some evidence that the children labeled as late bloomers showed better performance than they had previously. The authors concluded that the results could be explained by the self-fulfilling prophecy effects of teacher expectations. They reasoned that the expectations created about these "special" children caused the teachers to somehow treat them differently, so that they really did do better by the end of the year.

The controversy which followed publication of this finding was given impetus by the serious implications of the findings that teachers might be responsible for maintaining different student performance levels. Even more seriously, since minority students frequently have been at a disadvantage in meeting mainstream cultural and academic standards because they had different cultural backgrounds, they were often placed in the "slow" category. Through time, a cycle of being so labeled and performing up to that label could form a basis for continued minority group existence since members of the group would not have the chance to enter mainstream culture.

The seriousness of Rosenthal and Jacobsen's findings were, and are generally still considered convincing. Numerous replications, however, have not produced conclusive support for the argument, thus diminishing the potency of their results.

Thorndike (1968), White (1969), Brophy and Good (1970, 1974), and Fleming and Anttonen (1971) all provide good reviews of this area of research. Finn (1972) both reviews this research and places it in the general context of other work in biased assessment.

IV. 3.d. Cultural Differences. There is a small body of literature addressed to the effects of school response to cultural and linguistic differences (not deficits) on educational inequality. Stimulated by a growing awareness of problems faced by ethnic, especially black, students in public schools, research in this area has focused on the compatibility between the cultural patterns learned at home and those required and expected at school. It is assumed that experience affects learning and that if frequent disjunctions between the student's reality and that reflected in the content taught at school occur, learning may be made more difficult than if the content was more closely matched to the learner's reality. Underlying basic differences between the child's home and school experiences would, in other words, be in conflict resulting in depressed academic achievement and poor performance in school. Some of the research here, for example, focuses on styles of behavior expected and rewarded in the students' home situation, comparing it with those expected and valued in school. For example, the black child may learn to undertake responsibility for his own care and that of younger siblings; however, the skills and value orientations which comprise this ability are disregarded in a school where the teacher regulates and often severely restricts inter-personal activities as a means of directing students' attention toward academic achievement. Other research compares learning styles and sociolinguistic patterns, finding in some cases that patterns expected in the school violate patterns expected at home. These areas of "cultural conflict", it is argued, lead to misinterpretations on the parts of both minority students and their teachers. (Many of these studies are the work of anthropologists, e.g., Fuchs 1969, Rosenfeld 1971, Valentine 1971, and Gallimore, et al. 1974. For a position paper in this area see Johnson 1973.)

The cultural difference model which explains lower educational outcomes of lower-income and minority children using the concept of culture conflict was criticized by Valentine (1971, 1972) who argued that cultural differences would become simply a euphemism for cultural deficits or deprivation and that educators would simply use it as a rationalization for failure to succeed with minority children. Valentine argued that most black Americans tend to be bicultural, that is, they are able to negotiate white mainstream institutions as well as black institutions. Valentine argues, thus, that black Americans as well as other minority groups are perfectly capable of learning alternative cultural patterns to use when the need arises. An emergent position is that culture conflict is not sufficient to produce poor achievement in school; it must also be accompanied by some form of continuing negative institutional response to cultural differences. Recently, Gallimore, et al. (1974), in a study of minority high school students, have added to the conceptualization by describing what they term a "culture of conflict". A culture of conflict is a pattern of interaction which arises in cases where teachers and students of different backgrounds negatively respond to one another so that patterns of behavior are developed which would not occur in either culture. Teachers treat children in a way they would never consider treating children of their own group and similarly students treat teachers in ways they would never treat adults in their own community.

V. REMEDIAL EFFORTS AND COUNTER FORCES IN IMPLEMENTATION

The major actors and events determining the course of school desegregation policy have not been local officials, educators, or parents involved in the schools on a day-to-day basis. These individuals, however, have borne the brunt of the responsibility for the implementation of desegregation. In many ways, the demands exceeded the ability of local systems to respond constructively to the changes required.

Initially, school desegregation was associated with a strong ideological focus on the egalitarian principles of American society. The ideological basis, however, did not overshadow the cultural basis for white resistance to desegregation in the South. (See Section II.1) As a result of strong local resistance to desegregation, the courts and federal agencies were forced to devise measurable standards by which to assess compliance. In the process of this translation, some of the ideological force motivating the changes was lost. Local officials were told to implement specific plans narrowly focused upon achieving a certain degree of mixture by social race. Not able to argue the plans on educational merits nor in terms of an ideological position acceptable to their constituents, the officials could only present the plans as directives from higher and not always valued government sources, which, if not implemented, would result in the loss of funds or the application of other sanctions. (See Strout and Sroufe 1968 who outline the dilemma faced by school administrators.)

In the short run, desegregation has tended to separate communities into pro- and anti-desegregation factions which exert a great deal of creative energy, not in devising constructive means of achieving desegregation, but in countering one another and the latest emergent government policy. Piece by piece, the many changes required in the process of adaptation of the school district and the schools have been developed on the local level in response to specific pressure from external sources of power rather than in accord with a perspective that is ideologically meaningful on the local level.

In the absence of a meaningful ideological basis, perhaps parents, both black and white who are dissatisfied and discouraged with the public schools, have turned to alternatives associated with more coherent ideologies. White parents seeking to avoid desegregated schools have been responsible for the creation and expansion of alternative private schools emphasizing conservative values. Black parents, on the other hand, and some white parents (although for different reasons) have supported a movement to redistribute control over school decisions, emphasizing the role of the community in shaping its schools.

School desegregation on the local level, then, has tended to be a matter of reaction and adjustment to policy decisions forged at a higher level. The reactive nature of the local response is also reflected in educational developments which have come about in the wake of desegregation efforts. The various programs may be seen primarily as aimed at adjustments to the increased diversity of students now attending the same schools. In many cases, the emergent programs have merely been methods to allow the continuation of the status quo.

V.1. Methods of District Desegregation

Early methods of implementation of desegregation included "skillful districting", pupil placement, provisions for freedom of choice in school enrollment, some busing to disperse heavy concentrations of minority populations, pairing of schools to shift away from neighborhood schools, and implementation of the Pupil Assignment Act (Day, et al. 1963). These procedures, however, only slightly reduced school segregation and were not widely practiced, particularly in the South. Clark (1972a) in another review of earlier methods of implementing desegregation describes a number of "educational programs, plans, and gimmicks" offered in the 1960's to entice blacks to accept substitutes for serious and effective public school desegregation. Compensatory education and voucher programs are two plans he discusses.

There is a large body of literature on current school desegregation programs, most of which is descriptive. A summary of current implementation plans is provided by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1961, 1967a) and Brain (1963). Most of the other references describe desegregation practices in particular schools and school districts, such as that of Henderick (1968) which is a detailed history and current description of the Riverside, California, desegregation plan. Turner (1962) provides a similar report for New York City. Many of these studies evaluate procedures used to obtain racial balance in schools, as well as describe the current conditions in school systems. Camp, et al. (1969), for example, describes the Portland, Oregon, "Suburban Transfer Program". These descriptive studies vary in detail and comprehensiveness. In the following sections of this outline, desegregation techniques implemented in some of these areas are further detailed.

A great deal of the energy devoted to implementing school desegregation in many districts has involved devising plans whereby the degree of mixing required by the courts or HEW will be realized. The types of remedy which have become prominent at different periods represent the increasing demand of the courts for massive as opposed to token desegregation and the shift of judicial attention from rural Southern districts to urban districts including those in the North and the West.

(Aside from the descriptive materials mentioned above there are also some sources which were intended to serve as guides to desegregation implementation. Suchman, et al. 1958 is such a reference as is Wey and Corey 1959. Representing newer works of this sort is Ornstein's 1974 analysis. This book outlines organizational approaches for distributing decision-making authority and power in the community for school desegregation, especially in metropolitan areas.)

V. 1a. Open Enrollment and Freedom of Choice. Early attempts during the 1950's to desegregate the schools were often circumvented by laws and state constitutional amendments which had the effect of actually delaying the desegregation process. The most common device was pupil assignment laws which gave local schools the power to establish criteria for assigning students to schools. By manipulating the various requirements, local officials were able to preserve segregation (Orfield, 1969b:18).

Open enrollment and freedom of choice plans were methods of desegregation developed in the 1960's. Under these plans, no student was forced to transfer out of his neighborhood or local school to another, but individual students were given the opportunity to make transfers (both within and sometimes outside their district lines) if they wished to do so. The courts were not impressed with the results of such plans although it is possible to see both hypothetical advantages and disadvantages. Mizel (1968), for example, presents two views. The first view is favorable, but notes that much more time is needed for freedom of choice to start operating effectively. Unlike quota transfer plans, open enrollment plans do not deny black (or white) parents their democratic right to choose a school. The other view argues against open enrollment plans on the basis that general psychological and social restraints make the black's freedom to choose more theoretical than real. For example, Orfield (1969b:137), mentions a study by the Office of Education which identified twenty-five practical difficulties of free choice. One such difficulty concerned the method of making application forms for freedom of choice available to black parents. Usually these forms were given to the children to take home to be filled out. However, in some cases, black teachers were pressured by school officials to mark black students' choices for primarily black schools; parents were often afraid to take back to the school principal a request to transfer a child to a white school. (Also see Crockett 1957; Weinstein and Geisel 1962; Day, et al. 1963; and Binderman 1972.)

There is a general consensus in the literature that open enrollment and freedom of choice plans are not a successful approach to school desegregation (Saint Louis Board of Education 1969; Binderman 1972; and McAdams 1974). Later, attempts were made to make freedom of choice workable, using such things as assurances from the courts and school officials that guidelines directing school superintendents to assign free choice students to the nearest school with available space would be enforced. Compliance with these guidelines became an administrative nightmare and provoked considerable local opposition (Orfield 1969b:138).

V. 1.b. Rezoning. Especially in smaller cities or areas which have relatively small sections of high density black populations, desegregation has been achieved by some of the same methods originally used to preserve segregation, such as strategic site selection for schools. Other frequently used methods have included changing and enlarging the attendance areas of school districts.

Pairing, one such device, involves merging the attendance areas of two or more schools serving the same area. The concept was introduced in 1948 in Princeton, New Jersey, where two elementary school student populations were merged; students in grades K-5 were assigned to one school and students in grades 6-8, to the other. Swanson (1965) presents a detailed report of the introduction of the "Princeton Plan" in New York City, with special emphasis on resulting political ramifications.

In some cases where schools have been ordered to achieve racial balance contiguous attendance areas have been impossible given residential segregation. In these cases, satelliting may be used where a quota of students are sent to a school in an area not contiguous with their own.

In communities which have a larger number of schools, "central schools" have been established. This is essentially an extended form of pairing, where a whole district is made a single attendance zone and all students in one or two grades are placed in a single large school. Englewood, N.J., Berkeley, Cal., and Teaneck, N.J. all implemented this type of program to accomplish desegregation. A related idea is that of "educational parks." Several desegregated schools, serving a total student population of 5,000 to 30,000 would be grouped together to allow efficient use of staff and resouces, provide a wide range of administrative and auxiliary services, and offer expanded educational opportunities beyond the financial capabilities of the smaller schools. A number of educational advantages to such parks have been discussed. (See Fischer 1967 and Keppel 1967.) With regard to desegregation, educational parks, by combining smaller schools, would have the effect of substituting desegregated parks for segregated neighborhood schools.

(A general report by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights on racial isolation 1967b provides brief descriptions of several educational park proposals in East Orange, N.J., New York City, Berkeley, Cal., Pittsburg, Pa., and Albuquerque, N.M. as well as some discussion of the advantages of this plan. This reference also includes a comprehensive bibliography. A number of papers which further evaluate the potential of educational parks are combined in a special report by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 1967a.)

V. 1.c. Busing. In large urban districts where residential segregation is extreme, it is often impossible to obtain any degree of mixing without transporting some children out of their neighborhoods to other schools. With court pressure on urban areas such as Boston and Detroit to desegregate, the means of transportation, buses, have acquired an ascendancy in the 1970's as a symbol of desegregation. In the *Swann* v. *Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education* decision of 1971, the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of busing as one means by which a dual school system could be dismantled. The court cautioned, however, that the decision did not apply to using busing in de facto segregation based on neighborhood patterns and that when busing was employed, time and distance of busing should be carefully considered as well as the age of students to be bused. Despite these assurances, busing has become an emotional, political, and social symbol for many favoring neighborhood schools (Hermalin and Farley 1973). This is reflected by the massive, growing amount of literature concerning busing.

Mills (1973) presents one of the most comprehensive reviews of the busing issue in an edited collection which includes important articles on the background and legal history of busing, the debate on the effectiveness and implications of busing, and several case studies of particular busing plans. Also see Durham (1973), Rist (1974a), Mathews (1975) and Orfield (1975) for overviews of the busing issue.

The primary points of discussion in busing are its effectiveness in achieving equal education opportunity for black children and its ultimate social cost in terms of neighborhood disruption. In a detailed article, Armor (1972a) concludes that busing does not lead to improved grades, aspirations, and attitudes for black children. Pettigrew, et al. (1973) in an extensive reply to Armor and other opponents of mandatory busing, point out that, although the evidence is incomplete, busing does achieve legal desegregation and desegregated schools may improve the academic performance of black pupils and lead to increased college enrollment for black students (see Section VI for a more detailed discussion of these questions). Popular objections to busing tend to focus upon the element of being "forced" to send children to a particular school and the prospect of loss of neighborhood unity through the loss of neighborhood schools which serve as a force in preserving neighborhood traditions.

Busing is obviously just one factor in the complex issue of school desegregation. Although there is a great deal of discussion about busing, some suggest that busing is actually a phony issue. (See Askew 1972 and Durham 1973.) Harvey and Holmes (1972) and Green, et al. (1972) stress this point as well, indicating that the busing controversy is being used as an excuse to avoid facing the real issues, the development of a pluralistic society. Others, such as the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, have put what they consider the real issue underlying the busing controversy in more direct terms. One of the 1973 articles is entitled, "It's Not the Busing. It's the Niggers."

V. 1.d. Multi-district Desegregation. Coleman (1975) in some of his latest analyses of trends in school desegregation, points out that although segregation within districts has to some extent been alleviated, segregation between districts has accelerated. This pattern results in part from the demographic trends of black settlement in the inner cities with white migration to the suburban areas. For a number of reasons, the question of the meaningfulness of desegregating districts which are mostly black has been raised. This has focused attention upon the issue of metropolitan desegregation or desegregation across the school district lines which subdivide metropolis areas.

The most important court cases of the 1970's have concerned issues in urban desegregation one of which is metropolitan desegregation. The 1974 *Milliken* v. *Bradley* Supreme Court decision included this issue. In that case, the judges did not require desegregation across district lines, but the ultimate position of the courts is not yet clear. (See Section III.1.c.)

Popular support for multi-district desegregation is not high. As Gittell (1976) points out, consolidation of school districts has been a strong trend in the last twenty-five years. Contrary to these trends, however, consolidation of metropolitan districts has had a different history. State laws have been passed to allow more local input on consolidation decisions with the results that many referendums are turned down by local votes. Spokespeople against metropolitan desegregation have also at times included black leaders who argue that black control of city districts will be lost.

On the other hand, the push toward metropolitan desegregation is occurring at the same time as a push toward metropolitanization of services in general. There have been a number of educators, for example, who have advocated the metropolitanization of educational services for a variety of reasons. Battle (1973), for example, advocates cooperative arrangements between city and suburban school districts which can potentially break down current financial and ethnic boundaries between the city and suburb. With this plan, the financial base of the school system, the property area, is broader and more equally shared between schools. As another example, Levine (1973) further describes the advantages and disadvantages of the approach.

(For a detailed analysis of possible patterns of the implementation of metropolitan schools, see Ornstein 1974. For overviews of other problems in metropolitanization, see Scott 1972 and Glazer 1974. Also see Section V.3. on community control, a traditional pattern of school control that metropolitanization counters.)

V. 2. Community and Individual Resistance

Community-level resistance to desegregation has been provoked by the spread of beliefs, some grounded in fact and others not, about the harmful effects of desegregation on white school children. White parents have expressed fear and anxiety about sending their children to schools in certain neighborhoods; they have balked at the idea of their children attending lower status schools. They have complained about the breakup of friendship groups, the distance traveled to get to school, and the denial of their "rights" to live in a certain neighborhood and benefit from its schools. Other more extremist groups have resisted desegregation on the grounds that interracial contact will lead to interracial marriage and the evential degradation of the white race.

Belief in the validity of these concerns has spawned public, sometimes violent, demonstrations, harrassment of black families, a large increase in the number of private schools dedicated to segregation, and movement by white middle- and upper-income families to suburban school districts—all of which have succeeded in slowing the forward momentum of the desegregation process.

V. 2.a. Demonstrations, Protests, Harassment. Local resistance to school desegregation has included various forms of protest, demonstrations, and acts of violence against potential desegregators. School boycotts, picket lines, and protest marches which sometimes result in riots, assaults, and the destruction of hated symbols of desegregation such as school buses continue to be expressions of community resistance.

Local resistance to school desegregation has also included more seemingly premeditated forms of violence which in some cases have resulted in the loss of life. Acts of terrorism to prevent black children from attending white schools were undertaken by unorganized white resisters and groups such as the Ku Klux Klan, a secret society which experienced a revival when segregated institutions began to come under serious threat from civil rights activity in the early 1960's.

Materials on these methods of resistance to desegregation tend to be incorporated in general accounts of early desegregation in the South (e.g., Orfield 1969b) or in the general c-counts of the civil rights movement in the 1950's and 1960's. Accounts written for general audiences also exist. Coles' (1967) account of the experiences of black children in the Deep South during the early period of desegregation is probably the best known. It includes sections describing and analyzing the various forms of harassment encountered by black children and their families. (For other examples, see Braden's 1958 description of community resistance to residential desegregation in Louisville in the early 1950's. Chesler 1967 includes verbatim accounts of the experiences of early black school desegregators.)

Some research is also available concerning the role of community groups in desegregation implementation and the factors related to the degree of resistance which develops. An early study by Vander Zanden (1958) looked particularly at the kinds of resistance and the conditions under which it occurred. He proposed a number of generalizations and hypotheses including the following: 1) the exploitation of racial and desegregation issues for political purposes tends to be associated with an increase in resistance; 2) disagreement, competition, or conflict between levels or agencies of government over the policy or procedure to be pursued toward desegregation tends to intensify mass resistance; and 3) the prevalent "educative programs" designed to facilitate adult acceptance of desegregation, which operate through parent-teacher associations and civic groups, has tended to be at best a minor factor determining the incidence or severity of disturbances attendant upon desegregation.

Some of Vander Zander's generalizations have been supported in later work. Kirby, et al. (1973) investigated the school desegregation issue in ninety-one Northern and Western cities between 1963 and 1969. The study investigated such questions as the identity of power holders in decision-making, participants in desegregation-related decisions, and factors affecting conflict. The conclusions drawn were that the most important actors in desegregation were the civic elite; including mayors, businessmen, and school superintendents; the desegregation issue was not settled in the streets; and white citizen groups opposed to desegregation were rather ineffective as were pro-desegregation groups. Reporting the findings of the study with regard to community unrest, Kirby and Crain (1974) draw the conclusions that cities with militant black populations and school boards with a high level of internal conflict are more likely to have desegregation-related disturbances. Further information along these lines is included in Crain (1968).

(See also Dentler's 1965 article which looks at the various elements of community organization which influence desegregation, whether by impeding or facilitating action on the issue. Also see Killian and Crigg 1965 and Rogers 1967 for other general evaluations and descriptions of community disturbance patterns.)

V. 2.b. Private Schools. Particularly following the Supreme Court's decision and the 1964 Civil Rights Act, there has been a rapid increase in the number of private schools, especially in the South (Leeson 1966, 1967; Palmer 1971). In Mississippi, for example, between 1964 and 1971, the number of private schools jumped from under twenty to two hundred thirty-six. Many of these private schools which appear to have been started primarily as acts of resistance to desegregation have now become known as "segregation academies" by their detractors.

Some of the early efforts to avoid desegregation involved an attempt to create state-supported segregated private schools. The methods used whereby extensive state grants and loans were made to private schools or tuition grants were made to students who could then choose private schools were later declared illegal. (See Section III.1.f.) Although lacking state support, such private schools continue to exist, sometimes with the assistance of voluntary organizations such as churches which sponsor such schools.

(At this point, there is only a limited amount of literautre concerning the private school movement. There are two articles, however, that do emphasize the growing importance of private schools in relation to desegregation. One by Brown and Provizer 1972 is a case study of two segregation academies in a county in Georgia. The other by Terjon 1972, presents an overview of the role of segregated private schools and some initial data on the number of such institutions.)

V. 2.c. White Flight. There are a number of references which deal with the relationship between school desegregation and population movements in and out of school attendance areas (Pettigrew and Cramer 1959; Farley 1976; Orfield 1976). In some cases, this type of population movement ultimately leads to what has been called resegregation or the reestablishment of segregated patterns. A term that has become associated with certain types of population movement, "white flight", refers to what was originally believed to be a white response to desegregation. Leacock, et al. (1959), for example, defined white flight as "panic moving" where there was a quick sale and turnover of housing from whites to blacks. This movement was primarily thought to be initiated by desegregation.

Reporting the major findings of his larger work, *Trends in School Segregation, 1968-1973* (Coleman, et al. n.d.), Coleman (1975) suggests that desegregation of central city schools has accelerated the process of residential segregation between the city and the suburbs by increasing the extent of white flight. Where school district boundaries are basically coterminious with city-county municipal units, such residential segregation is reflected in school enrollment figures. Coleman finds that the patterns of mass exodus have occurred during the year of school desegregation in a number of cities, especially in the larger cities where there is a higher proportion of black students. Green and Pettigrew (1976) are highly critical of Coleman's research methodology which, they claim, has biased his results. Other articles by Mumford (1973), Farley (1976), Orfield (1976), and Rist and Orfield (1976) substantiate Green and Pettigrew's claim and look more closely at the nature of white flight, particularly questioning whether white flight is initiated and supported by forced school desegregation, or is primarily an independent occurrence which results from: (1) a general trend toward declining enrollments primarily in cities but also in many suburbs, (2) the pattern of white out-migration from cities which developed primarily as a result of lack of housing long before the school desegregation issue was a dominant social pressure, or (3) special local circumstances which occur simultaneously with desegregation, such as the closing of an industry. Regardless of its causes, whether they be social, economic, or political, white flight is seen as an important issue to deal with in educational planning (Rist and Orfield 1976). As described above, the presence of an ample number of whites in a desegregating district has achieved the position of a high priority concern for some who argue that whites are necessary both in terms of financial resouces and their effect on black achievement scores. (See Section IV.)

V. 3. Community Control and Decentralization

Issues of decentralization and community control became increasingly important in the mid 1960's. Although the two issues derive from different perspectives, they both seem to have gained momentum as a result of court-ordered desegregation.

Proponents of decentralization are most often white parents who feel that their control of schools has been usurped by large bureaucratic bodies which are more responsive, especially with regard to desegregation, to the demands of federal officials than to local citizens. This group advocates the dissolution of the massive bureaucracies and the return of control to local units. The neighborhood school symbolizes the decentralization issue. Although it is conceded that such schools do promote a closer school-community bond, they have been attacked on the grounds that they maintain de facto segregation. (See Fischer 1964, Dodson 1965, Burt and Alexander 1969, and Somerville 1969.) Since the neighborhood school concept is counter to current trends in desegregation, especially multidistrict desegregation, a great deal of conflict has been generated at the community level by proponents of this approach.

Community control, on the other hand, tends to be a position espoused by blacks frustrated by the slow pace of desegregation and the failure of expected positive outcomes for their children. For blacks who have come to believe that present school systems are fundamentally racist in their social and cultural organization, community control is seen as a means of transferring control of schools to black groups who will be more responsive to the needs of black children. Other blacks have focused on the educational importance of control. They are concerned with the negative psychological consequences for blacks of lack of control over important institutions which affect their lives. They cite Coleman, et al.'s (1966) finding that increases in black children's sense of control over their environment promotes higher academic achievement as evidence of the need for black control of schools. With community control, the focus of the black perspective on education opportunities shifts from improved achievement to improved self-respect as a means of stimulating achievement gains.

(For more information on these topics, see Altschuler 1970 for a discussion of community control, Kirp 1970 for discussion of the legality of community control, and D. Cohen 1969 for information on both decentralization and community control as well as a discussion of the general confusion produced by conflicting research results which question whether either approach to school reorganization will produce more positive educational outcomes.

V. 4. The Role of School Personnel in District Desegregation

Administrators, school board members, principals, and teachers often fear the implementation of desegregation because it is disruptive. It often requires complicated attendance plans, student and teacher transfers as well as provisions and facilities for new students in a school. Although these participants in the desegregation process could provide a strong voice of support which might calm parental fears about and promote a smooth transition to desegregated schools, they have usually not done so. Political reasons for this failure are discussed in the two subsections which follow.

Teacher organizations have also been relatively inactive in desegregation although some have come to the aid of black teachers who tended to be displaced when desegregation occurred.

V. 4.a. School Boards and Administrators. Local school boards have been involved in desegregation struggles for a long period of time. During the 1950's, school boards tried to forestall the desegration forces by upgrading black schools. Later, local boards in other areas affected by increasing residential segregation also made attempts to avert the court's attention by developing plans for some desegregation of schools. (See, for example, Stout and Sroufe 1968.)

Many have argued that local school boards have little real power as a result of the increased politicalization of education which, in many cases, has placed the educational decision-making process in the hands of state legislators. Also, the consolidation of school districts, which limits parental access and increases bureaucracy, and the erosion of administrative control of classroom activities in the face of increased teacher militancy have been cited as further reasons for loss of local administrative power. (See, for example, Goodman 1968 and Guthrie and Skene 1973.) This lack of power seems to have been further accentuated by the threat of desegregation. Desegregation is disruptive to school officials because it undermines the power base from which they operate. School superintendents, who normally have some control over educational policy have no power to prevent court-ordered desegregations. Superintendents also have no educational basis for advocating desegregation since the research findings on academic outcomes are inconclusive. At the same time, traditional backers of the school board (those most actively involved and those who provide the schools' financial base), most often white middle-income parents, are often opposed to or at least divided over the issue of desegregated schools. At the same time the board, entrusted with the task of implementing desegregation at the district level, faces counter pressures from other local interests. Groups, including civil rights groups, who favor desegregation may also represent a new community force with which the school board must contend. This withdrawal of traditional support, coupled with the confrontation with new interest groups, is seen as a difficulty which may prevent the board from taking any decisive action, thus increasing the possibility of conflict.

One proposed solution to the board's dilemma has been to set up citizen advisory committees and hold public meetings to symbolize community participation and legitimization of decisions on desegregation implementation. It has been suggested, however, that such groups are effective only when they include individuals who are influential in the community.

(For an interesting case study of one school board's attempt to develop a provisional desegregation plan, see Stout and Sroufe 1968; for the effect of school board dissention on conflict over desegregation, see Vander Zanden 1958, and Kirby and Crain 1974; for the influence of community leaders on local desegregation, see King and Mayer 1972, and Kirby and Crain 1974.)

V. 4.b. Teachers. Soon after the 1964 Civil Rights Act ordered large-scale and immediate desegregation of public schools, it became apparent that faculty desegregation would not proceed at the same rate as desegregation of student bodies. An immediate consequence of desegregation was a reduction in the number of black teachers and administrators. Typically, whenever black students were transfered to white schools, black teachers were dismissed or transfered to crowded black schools. When whole schools were closed (which most frequently happened to black schools ostensibly because their facilities were not as good as those in white schools), teachers, principals, and other staff members were often left without jobs. In some states school districts changed certification policies, failed to renew contracts, and harassed teachers who were black or who advocated civil rights. This practice enabled the districts to hire more conservative white teachers. In other places, black teachers were assigned to desegregated schools in some "special" capacity, such as black student counselor or special education teacher, which kept them isolated from contact with most of the predominantly white students. These tactics also reduced job opportunities for black graduates in education. (For more information, see National Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities of the National Education Association 1965, Ozmon 1965, and Egerton 1967.)

Since 1970, more strict policies for teacher assignments have been established at the insistence of black leaders and the National Education Association. Although it is scanty, some research now exists which indicates the positive effects that black teachers, principals, and other staff members can have in desegregated schools. For information on the positive outcomes of black teachers and staff as role models for black children, see Lamanna 1965; for positive effects on black achievement scores, see Spady 1973; for positive effects on educational attainment, see Darkenwald 1975; for the effect on reducing violence and discipline, see Pettigrew 1975.

There is some literature concerned with the role of teacher organizations in desegregation. Once article by Myers (1966) suggests that the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), through its locals, can plan a valuable role in desegregation if its members recognize that desegregation is a part of a larger school reform and educational improvement movement. However, a look at the literature on teacher groups suggests they have taken a limited and sometimes negative stand on school desegregation.

Groff (1962) and Dewing (1968) present overviews of AFT and NEA (National Education Association) policy regarding school desegregation since the 1930's. They suggest that because of their size and collective nature, these organizations are often forced to take a moderate position with regard to controversial issues like desegregation. On the other hand, as early as 1954 NEA was involved in protecting the rights of black teachers who lost their jobs as a consequence of desegregation. Initially NEA provided counseling and advice as well as limited financial assistance to displaced teachers. In 1965 they organized a drive to raise one million dollars to help with legal fees made necessary by school administrative attempts to block the hiring and rehiring of black teachers in newly desegregated districts. (See Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities of the National Education Association 1965.)

One reference notes specifically how a local teacher organization can affect segregation. Sobel (1973:2) cites an incident where teachers blocked the implementation of a research program which would have substantially increased documentary evidence of the value of integrated education: "They did so because they were fearful that the project might reveal racism among some of the teaching staff and possibly lead to dismissal, loss of tenure, community favor, or something similar. Sobel also suggests that the developing pattern of teacher organization and teacher militancy may be linked to white resistance to social race mixing, representing one of the more covert deterrents to desegregation which runs through society.

V. 5. Educational Programs and Practices Related to Desegregation

Relative to the elaborate preparation that went into designing busing plans and redrawing district lines to achieve desegregated schools, changes in the educational system itself as a result of desegregation have been slight. A number of reasons have been suggested for this. Limitations on the school's ability to change may stem from lack of community committment to desegregation which results in refusals to vote bond issues to finance programs for meeting the individual needs of new students in the schools (M. Deutsch 1967a) as well as from resistance by school personnel to innovations which threaten existing and familiar patterns of the social organization of the school, such as means of controlling and grouping pupils and status relationships among staff members (Willover, et al. 1973, Baratz 1975). Eddy (1975) in one of the few anthropological studies of the desegregation process, found that a new educational program, introduced simultaneously with desegregation, helped to re-establish traditional social status positions. According to Eddy's analysis, the program provided a vehicle for establishing black-white faculty relationships where black teachers were placed in a position of lesser autonomy relative to whites. Following the initial period of faculty desegregation, once the relationships were established, the program was more-or-less discontinued.

Education programs utilized and practices emergent in desegregated schools can be seen primarily as approaches to handling problems resulting from increased diversity among the student body. These approaches reflect assumptions about the basis of the diversity and the value placed on assimilative versus pluralistic models of American society. (See Section II.4.)

Tracking and ability grouping are methods of dealing with perceived differences in learning ability. Separation of children according to criteria such as scores on standardized tests results in over-representation of black children in lower groups. Because of this segregative effect, "racially identifiable" classes have been frowned upon by federal agencies and the courts in some cases have found tracking systems to be in violation of the Constitution. (See Section III.1.e.)

Another phenomenon encountered in desegregated schools involves the expulsion of black students by various formal and informal means such as suspensions. These students, referred to as "pushouts" in the literature describing such patterns, are seen in the schools as behavior and disciplinary problems.

Another approach, compensatory education, involves the provision of remedial programs designed to aid students disadvantaged by their home environments. These programs were originally developed to correct "cultural deprivation" which was posited as a cause of depressed educational outcomes for minority and lower-income children. Federal support for these programs provided through the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act provided a stimulus for the development of this approach. For various reasons, support for compensatory education is waning.

Another way of conceptualizing improved education and increased educational opportunity for minority students in desegregated schools has been to focus upon diversifying education rather than homogenizing the students. Differences in students are conceived as differences in cultural backgrounds. One of the goals stated in the Minnesota State Board of Education Guideline, for example, contained the following definition of inter-cultural education, as a goal of its system:

> . . .that educational process. . . by which all individuals gain a knowledge, respect, and appreciation for the language patterns, history, heritage, culture, values and contributions to mankind of minority groups with special emphasis on Black-Americans, Spanish-surnamed Americans, American-Indians and Orientals, so as to enable all individuals to live better in a pluralistic society (1971:52).

These approaches vary in their emphases on the degree to which all students are supposed to become multi-cultural and the emphasis placed on mutual respect. Ethnic studies was an early emphasis in this approach. Although this trend has captured the attention of many educators (see Stent, et al. 1973, for example) it has not received the attention on the national level that the shortcomings of compensatory education and desegregation programs have.

A characteristic of the programs which have been utilized, is that they tend to be based on remedies directed primarily to the individual student. Remedies focused upon alteration of the social order of the school as a result of many factors tend to be less frequent and unadopted on a large scale. An interesting example of such a proposed remedy and one which is based upon a theoretical orientation, is referred to by Cohen (1972a). This remedy harks back to one of the initial components of the argument against segregation presented in *Brown*. There has been some research which suggests that one reason why school desegregation has not produced uniformly positive outcomes for black children is that the social stigma of being black is often reinforced in the classroom, although social race mixing has occurred. Katz and Benjamin (1960) and Cohen (1972a) found that when black and white students were asked to perform tasks in a laboratory setting, a pattern of white dominance emerged. They believed this pattern to be a result of higher expectations, held by both blacks and whites, for members of the higher status group (factors other than social race were controlled). Cohen describes a training process investigated in the laboratory whereby black and white students' expectations about the task-performing ability of blacks are raised, thus producing a situation in which blacks and whites may interact on an "equal status" basis. Cohen cautions that achievement differences can also provide a basis for a status order in classrooms because achievement is highly rewarded in school. This achievementbased order may often be confounded with the social-race status order, thus making equal status contact between blacks and whites and to achieve in a traditional school setting.

V. 5.a. Tracking and Ability Grouping. The educational value of a heterogeneous mixture of students by ability versus a homogeneous mixture (referred to as "ability grouping" or "tracking") has been a subject of debate. A good history of research on the effects of grouping is provided by Goldberg, et al. (1966), where studies and discussion on the subject since the 1920's are traced. This research, centering upon the issue of whether students of like ability should be grouped together for instructional purposes, is inconclusive.

More recently, the question of grouping has become entangled with desegregation issues since minority- and lower-income children tend to be placed in lower tracts. A pair of articles by Weber and Pearl (1966) illustrate this trend. Weber argued that grouping can be administratively justified to further the progress of students of differing ability and achievement along a uniform curriculum. Pearl argued against grouping, stressing that slower groups frequently are minority or economically poor student groups. This "academically" based separation then maintains segregation. Green (1973) also argues against grouping via tracking and inadequate testing procedures. She says that grouping reinforces the effects of years of discriminatory treatment in the education of black children by tracking them in separate and unequal classrooms. (For further information see Lacey 1966 and Johnson 1969.)

There has been some court action concerning tracking (see Section III.1.e.). The aspect of tracking isolated by the courts as illegal has been the biased nature of assessment procedures such as standardized tests. In a rare observational study, Rist (1973) found rigid within-class ability grouping in the St. Louis classes he followed for two and a half years. Because of the longitudinal nature of the study and dependence upon observation, he was present to note the processes involved in forming and maintaining the groups. He concludes that the groups were initially established by the teacher on the basis of social class characteristics. If such subtle processes are widespread, court action may prove ineffective toward such methods of isolation and discriminatory treatment.

V. 5.b. Pushouts. In this form of resegregation, a disproportionate number of minority students are expelled, suspended, or encouraged by informal means to leave school. Especially in the South, black students have suffered an unusually high number of school suspensions and expulsions since court-ordered desegregation.

One of the most extensive evaluations of this phenomenon is presented in a report by the Southern Regional Council and the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial (1973). The report surveys rules, regulations, practices, and disciplinary methods used in Southern schools to push blacks out of schools. One finding was that the expulsion rate for black students was far greater than that for non-minority students. There are also a number of city-specific studies regarding pushouts, such as those of Clarke (1973) and Miller (1975). Clarke's study closely reanalyzed the findings of a New Orleans Parish Superintendent's Task Force on Suspensions for 1972. Clarke defined the extent of pushouts by a group-to-group comparison of suspensions, finding indications of what he considered blatant racism.

Recognition of pushouts as a desegregation-related problem has generated some oraganizational response. Miller (1975) for example, describes the Massachusetts Advocacy Center's School Desegregation Project which provides representation to individual students in administrative hearings to assure that they were accorded due process and to monitor student discipline practices during the implementation of the desegregation order.

(For an additional source see Yudof 1975; Demarest and Jorden 1975 present a detailed discussion of the legal aspects of suspensions.)

V. 5.c. Compensatory Education. Compensatory education programs burgeoned in the mid-sixties under the impetus of the theoretical notion of social and cultural deprivation of poor peoples in the United States. (See Section IV. 3.a. for a review of the literature delineating this concept.) This section identifies some of the principal literature on the kinds of programs developed under the compensatory education umbrella and subsequent responses to these programs.

The most comprehensive early review of the different kinds of compensatory education programs in the U.S. from pre-school through college is found in Gordon and Wilkerson (1966). They delineate seven categories of emphases in the diverse range of remedies associated with the educational problems of disadvantaged youth. These include:

(1) reading and language development,
(2) extra-curricular innovation,
(3) counseling and guidance,
(4) parental involvement, and
(5) community involvement.

The launching of Project Head Start in the summer of 1965 by the Office of Economic Opportunity as a part of President Lyndon Johnson's War on Poverty represented massive national involvement in compensatory education. Early intervention was a major premise to Head Start programs. Elkind (1969:32) phrases the orientation as follows:

> If disadvantaged children were to profit from what the schools had to offer, it was argued, then they need a "Head Start" in order to catch up with middle-class children.

Payne, et al. (1973) present a critical review of the programmatic facets of Head Start implementation that encompasses paraprofessionals' roles, teachers' qualifications, lunch and snack provisions—nutritional quality and children's food in-take, transportation for children and parents, and parent and community involvement. Their review delineates three distinct types of Head Start programs: 1) full year/part day, 2) full year/full day, and 3) summer. They further provide a chronology of events in the development of Head Start, its move from the aegis of the Office of Economic Opportunity to HEW's Office of Child Development, and the shift in focus to day care centers during the Nixon administration. Payne, et al. describe Head Start programs and include an overview of the critical literature on Head Start, including the Westinghouse-Ohio Report, a study whose design was hotly debated, and whose report on the lack of intellectual achievement of previous Head Start enrollees did much to discredit this form of compensatory education in popular eyes. (For another critical evaluation, see White, et al. 1973. See also Smith and Bissell 1970.) The Payne book also presents a number of proposals for "corrective practices for Head Start type programs, including a major component on "Teaching Parents How to Teach." Basically, the Payne recommendations view the mechanisms of parent and community action involvement of Head Start as in keeping with OEO's "community action" orientation rather than taking a critical view of programs on the basis of their underlying assumptions about the culture of the children.

As delineated in Gordon and Wilkerson (1966) and a more recent selected survey, *Compensatory Education Programs, Ages 2 to 8* edited by Julian C. Stanley (1973), the initial impetus of Head Start's early intervention was expanded through the initial Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and later acts to provide on-going intensified programs of remedial and special educational services to children from homes designated as disadvantaged. This expansion included initiation of Follow Through Programs in elementary schools and Upward Bound for high school students. D. Cohen (1972) contrasts the success of Upward Bound programs by their selection of promising (and motivated) participants late in high school and the program's concrete goal of nearly guaranteed college matriculation for its graduates to the largely undifferentiated goals and undifferentiated clientele of other compensatory education programs. He further identifies and criticizes what he sees as common assumptions about the impact of schooling performance on adult success in the job and social world, and about education as an adequate eradicant of poverty via upward job mobility that underlie a diversity of specific compensatory education projects/goals. The assumption he questions is: "that there has been plenty of room at the top and that schooling was the appropriate escalator" (D. Cohen 1972:153).

A range of other criticisms have put compensatory education in disfavor since the Westinghouse Report's initial evaluation in 1969 about the lack of significant difference between Head Start and non-Head Start children on tests of language development and the Stanford Achievement tests. There are those who have found little evidence through test scores that compensatory education has had a positive impact on the intellectual achievement of so-called disadvantaged school children, sufficient to justify the large financial input to the programs.

Other critics have spoken from a different perspective. For example, Baratz and Baratz (1970) criticize early intervention programs for the ethnocentric judgments encompassed in the goals of these programs to alter the black child's home environment including changing patterns of child-rearing in the home and replacing the child's language and cognitive skills. These goals and their implementation procedures stem, according to the Baratzes, from an ignorance of black culture and deny important strengths within that culture that are integral for designing successful early childhood programs. Stanley (1973) sums up a more fundamental issue that critics such as the Baratzes label "intellectual racism," an issue that is often ignored in the criticisms of those who have argued against compensatory education on the basis of test scores:

> "compensatory education," as presently understood, is counterproductive. It seems to stem, on the one hand, from the kinds of motivations Winschel (1970) describes—prejudice, do-goodness, conscience-salving, and maintenance of the status quo—and, on the other hand, from a reluctance to tackle the larger project of revamping our entire educational structure (Stanley 1973:205).

The differences between these two sets of critics, in other words, seem to lie in the degree to which an assimilative versus a pluralistic model of American society is held. (See Section II.4.) In any event, support for compensatory education has been seriously eroded.

V. 5.d. Multi-cultural Approaches. Emergent in the late 1960's was a trend to replace the heavy emphasis on compensatory education—eschewed for its negative connotations—with ethnic and cultural heritage programs in elementary and secondary public schools. In recommending passage of the Emergency School Aid and Quality Integrated Education bill, the House committee (as quoted in Giles 1974:6) iterated the goal of this shift in emphasis by its conclusion that:

> children with differing languages and cultures must be allowed to learn and respect the language and culture of the group to which they belong. All children will benefit from an opportunity to learn about the diverse cultural heritage of their classmates.

A heterogeneous school environment as prerequisite for achieving equality of educational opportunity was thereby set forth not only as a matter of the composition of school populations by social race, but integration and quality education were explicitly expanded in definition to encompass the curriculum as well.

The impetus for multi-cultural approaches in school curricula, however, predates federal statute recognition. Its developmental directions can be viewed in a diverse range of curriculum and teacher resource guides initiated from the mid-sixties on by individual school systems (see Daheim 1965, and New York City Board of Education 1968 for early examples) in response to majority student needs/pressures for relevant course content or to state curriculum reform mandates. This trend largely involved what became referred to as "ethnic studies." (For example, see the Pennsylvania State Department of Public Instruction's booklet by Haller 1970, designed to answer social studies teachers' questions about implementing new state regulations that require integrating "major contributions made by Negroes and other racial and ethnic groups" into all state public school courses on United States and Pennsylvania history.)

A major division in approaches to curriculum integration has to do with the degree to which "ethnic studies" is set apart from other courses. One philosophy stated in a 1970 survey by Education U.S.A. as that advocated by nearly all educators holds that:

> the ultimate and ideal way to handle material on blacks and other ethnic groups is to weave it into the regular curriculum as an integral part of everything that is taught from kindergarten to grade 12 (National School Public Relations Association 1970:4).

The survey also reported descriptive information about curriculum projects in selected U.S. cities that follow a second philosophy in implementing a multi-cultural approach: separate courses on ethnic groups, such as African heritage classes in schools, or high school courses—required or elective—ranging from Afro-American history to Swahili to Latin American and Asian studies.

A more recent and evaluative look at school district curriculum guides and programs that follow these two philosophies operative in the ethnic studies field is presented in Giles (1974). In reviewing Afro-American studies programs from a number of school districts, he noted variations as to whether there are separate black studies courses for black students only, separate courses for minority studies for white students, and so forth. He labels and criticizes three distinct orientations to black studies: contributionism, black identify, and a thematic approach.

Controversy discernable in the literature over ethnic study approaches to education reflects some of the major controversies inherent in the differences between general perspectives on desegregation (see Section II) and argued in the question of the causes of educational failure (see Section IV). A yearbook published by the National Council for the Social Studies on teaching ethnic studies provides a good example of the underlying themes as manifest in critiques by proponents of ethnic study approaches. One contributor to the volume edited by Banks (1973), Larry Cuban, focuses on the teacher as the most important variable in achieving multi-cultural perspectives and addresses questions of teacher attitudes, behavior, and strategies as well as academic training. Anthropologist Mildred Dickeman locates what she calls the racist design of schools in their function to perpetuate American middle-class economic goals that pit personal individual success against family and kinship loyalties in which ethnic heritage is rooted. Thus, she cautions that ethnic studies which emphasize culture hero "success" stories may undercut the very ethnic identity they aim to reaffirm. Contributor Barbara Sizemore contends that curriculum revision and teacher recruitment alone are band-aid approaches. Multi-cultural learning must involve a restructuring of schools so that they become institutions for education rather than indoctrination. At present, multi-cultural approaches are in a formative period. The criticisms given in the 1973 volume referred to above indicate that with regard to ethnic studies, one of the earliest manifestations, multi-cultural approaches were still in 1973 a subject of debate as to what constitute their essential characteristics.

A second basic multi-cultural approach which has to some extent augmented or replaced the ethnic studies emphasis (Giles 1974:146) concerns more basic elements of the learning-teaching matrix. To some extent based upon and respondent to cultural differences (see Section IV.3.d.), these approaches consider alternative learning styles that tend to vary with ethnic backgroud. Bilingual programs represent one direction of such an approach. A legal precident for bilingual programs was set in 1968 by the Bilinqual Education Act—Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Francesco Cordasco, with Diego Castellanos (Banks 1973), presents an overview of this legislation in the context of methodological issues involved in educating Puerto Rican children who enter the public school system from homes in which Spanish is the spoken language. Education for such children, these authors state, must begin with the languare of the child:

> While learning to read and write his mother tongue [Spanish], the child needs careful training in learning, understanding, and speaking English as a Second Language (ESL) through an aural-oral approach before learning to read and write it. (1973:231)

Thus, "bilingual education" is defined as instruction in *two* languages. The alternative to using both English and Spanish as media of instruction of the school's curriculum for Puerto Rican children has been, according to Cordasco and Castellanos, "functional illiteracy" in both languages (Banks 1973:228). However, these authors follow the impetus of other multi-cultural approaches already reviewed in maintaining that:

> . . . the instructural use of the Spanish language in the classroom is not sufficient in itself to improve the education of these children and that a new curriculum must be devised with *cultural* as well as *language* requirements. A truly effective program of bilingual education should encompass bicultural education as well. It should include systematic curricular coverage of the history and heritage of Puerto Rico. In fact, such inclusions often are as important for the student's effective development as the use of the Spanish language is for developing his cognitive skills, or as the learning of English as a second language is for his socioeconomic survival (1973:234).

The methodological issues delineated by "bilingual education" approaches are also evidenced in the questions raised by educators and linguists about the distinct and systematic characteristics of English spoken by Afro-American children, which is called by various terms: Non-Standard Negro English, "Black English" (Aarons, et al. 1969; Dillard 1973). Identification of the structure of this spoken language is viewed by many as a key to developing processes of teaching reading to black children.

V. 5.e. Staff Adjustment. Although there are a few studies of the social processes which occur in the establishment of behavioral patterns in newly desegregated schools (Peterson 1975, Eddy 1975), the topic has primarily been a concern of program developers seeking to assist teachers in the transition. Five approaches are discernable in these desegregation training programs.

One such approach places major emphasis upon increasing personnel sensitivity toward the ethnic student's problems. Frequently programs centered around such topics are presented at summer institutes or in the form of inservice courses. An example of such an institute is described by Fielder and Dychman (1967). This institute was held for a selected group of teachers and community members to develop skills, techniques, and understandings necessary to solve problems incident to desegregation. (Also see Banaka, et al. 1971.)

A second approach includes curriculum guides and teacher guide books for multi-ethnic classrooms. An example of such a handbook is one developed by the federally funded Far West Laboratory for Education Research and Development to acquaint school personnel with data relevant to black people in the U.S. (Forbes n.d.). Other handbooks of this type are oriented toward human relations. (See Oklahoma State Department of Education 1971 and Arnez 1973.)

The third approach advocates establishment of special teaching and counselor positions to help in desegregation. Smith (1971), for example, details how a guidance counselor model could be revised to be more influential for black students. (Also see Kaplan and Coleman 1963, and Bryson and Mowu 1973.)

A fourth approach seeks to analyze student behavior in such a way as to help teachers and counselors deal with multi-racial classes. For example, Noar 1966 provides a guide for beginning teachers who will be involved in desegregation. Other references following this mode are Willie 1964, Klopf and Bowman 1966, Burger 1968, and Vontress 1969.

A final approach reflecting perhaps the "human potential movement" is psychology included sensitivity training through directed small group interaction. Westphal 1970, for example, describes such training sessions used in Minneapolis to make city personnel more aware of attitudes that can frustrate equal opportunity programs. Irvine and Brierley 1973 describe another series of sessions or workshops which were conducted to assist teams of public school teachers and principals, involving both blacks and whites, in interpersonal relations. For other examples see Caliguir 1970, T. Clark 1970, Levine and Mares 1970, and Lowe 1973.

VI. RESEARCH ON OUTCOMES OF DESEGREGATION

Beginning in the late 1950's, interest in the effects of desegregation on public school led social scientists to undertake many varied studies of social race mixing in the educational system. Some of these studies, which will be discussed in this section, are directed at investigating the consequences for children and staff of mixing blacks and whites in schools and classrooms.

Research on social race mixing, or desegregation, in schools usually focuses on differences between students in segregated and desegregated situations. One problem in comparing findings from these studies lies in the fact that "desegregated" school settings have been defined by a range of black-white ratios. Pettigrew (1969) has argued that desegregated schools may vary widely in the quality of interracial contact that takes place within them. When the school climate is characterized by a high degree of interracial acceptance, more positive outcomes may be expected. There are other problems as well. Some studies compare desegregated schools while others compare classrooms. The circumstances under which desegregation takes place, such as school attendance plans, changing residential patterns and ability grouping are also important. These are significant differences which are sometimes ignored in interpreting research results.

The outcomes variables, or the consequences of desegregation, can be grouped under three major headings: educational, psychological, and social outcomes. These headings reflect the particular orientations of the social scientists who have done the majority of the work on desegregation outcomes. Because many studies have been narrowly focused, there has been little attempt to integrate the findings from these diverse approaches; however, the findings under each contribute to a general understanding of the consequences of desegregation. The outcome variables, too, have been variously defined and will be described in the subsections which follow.

To date, most of the research has focused on the early grades and has been conducted in the North where neighborhood or natural desegregation (changes in school populations as a result of changing residential patterns), rather than desegregation which requires large-scale transfer of pupils, is the rule. This research has been carried by white investigators. Most of the studies also have been cross-sectional in design, meaning that they compare black and white children across schools of differing racial percentages. There has been less emphasis on longitudinal studies which would allow a look at the effects of sustained change as students proceed through desegregated schools. Both types of studies, however, often fail or are unable to match students in comparison groups by characteristics such as family background, school quality, or achievement scores upon entering the desegregated situation in order that observed differences between segregated and desegregated blacks may be explained by other variations—such as school quality. Case studies, though not necessarily representative, would provide more information on the process of desegregation and the subsequent establishment of social patterns than do cross-sectional or longitudinal studies based on limited knowledge of the cultural context.

After nearly two decades, desegregation research remains at the descriptive level in the sense that it has mainly documented what has happened as a result of desegregation. Studies have demonstrated patterns of black-white differences on outcome variables, but attempts at generalizing black-white patterns have not been particularly successful. Non-significant or mixed findings for research hypotheses, the wide range of background and extraneous variables which are hard to measure but which may theoretically be considered influential, as well as differences in sample populations, tests administered, variables studied and controlled, measures used for eliciting information, and procedures used in analyzing data limit the comparability of research efforts. There has generally been a lack of theoretical development in the field of desegregation research and, as a result, little is understood about why desegregation has such different results in different situations.

To conclude, findings from the desegregation research to date suggest that social race mixing alone has little consistent effect on black-white outcomes. Such different results indicate a need to look at a multiplicity of factors rather than isolated variables when investigating desegregation outcomes.

Reviews of the research on outcomes of desegregation are presented in Weinburg (1968) and St. John (1975). St. John's work is especially good for its appendices which list studies under each of the outcome variables by location, target population, instruments, controls, and tests used as well as summaries of comparisons made and results obtained. Weinburg reviews a large number of unpublished works. Volume 39 (No. 2, 1975) of the journal, *Law and Contemporary Problems*, include short recent overviews of the research on these outcome variables.

VI. 1. Educational Outcomes

By far the greatest amount of desegregation research time and money has been spent on investigating the question: What effects does social race mixing have on educational success for black and white children? The most ambitious work on educational outcomes is the national survey conducted by James Coleman and associates (Coleman, et al. 1966) entitled Equality of Educational Opportunity Survey (EEOS). This survey was commissioned by the U.S. Congress as a provision of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and was designed to investigate the availability of educational opportunities in public education to individuals by social race, color, religion, and national origin. The research involved studying 570,000 school children and 60,000 teachers at 4,000 schools. Although psychological and social outcomes were investigated as part of this research, the primary emphasis was on the explanation of differences in educational outcomes. In interpreting their task, the researchers defined educational outcomes rather narrowly as academic achievement and investigated the effects of family background, school curriculum and facilities, and teacher and student body characteristics on academic achievement test scores.

Most studies of educational effects, both before and after the Coleman survey, have also focused on achievement scores. A few studies investigate academic attainment (amount of education completed) and subsequent occupational attainment as indicators of educational success.

Staff displacement and changes in the educational system as a result of desegregation, which might also be considered outcomes of desegregation, have been included in Section V.

VI. 1.a. Academic Achievement. Academic achievement is the variable most often used to measure the effect of desegregation on students' educational success. Academic achievement in desegregation research has usually been assessed by comparing standardized IQ or achievement test scores (verbal and math achievement scores are sometimes evaluated separately or they may be lumped as an indication of general ability) for blacks in segregated versus desegregated schools, for blacks in desegregated schools with national test score norms, or by comparing the extent of the gap between black and white scores for students in the two types of schools.

A number of cautions are advised when interpreting the results of research on desegregation and academic achievement. First, changing social and political climates manifest by such things as changing social-race composition of neighborhoods and changing desegregation policies since 1954 (when comparative data on black-white differences on standardized test scores were first published) makes cross-study comparisons tenuous. In the earlier studies (those before 1966), for example, achievement was sometimes measured by grades as well as by test scores. Increases in black achievement scores for desegregated pupils were more frequently reported during that period. The use of grades as measures of achievement was soon discouraged because it was felt that teachers' perceptions of academic standards and evaluation as well as the content of the material they taught differed so greatly both within and between schools as to severely bias grades. These early results may also reflect the fact that most blacks in desegregated schools during that period were there by choice as a result of neighborhood desegregation and that most "desegregated" schools had only a few token blacks and remained predominantly white. These conditions no longer exist in many parts of the country where court decisions of the 1960's and early 1970's have required desegregation programs which insure racial balance through the requirement of district-wide desegregation or large-scale busing.

From the mid 1960's to the present, achievement and IQ test scores rather than grades have been used as the criterion for measuring academic growth because they were believed to represent an objective measure of children's progress in school. Recently problems associated with the use of these tests have been pointed out, and the assumption that they are "objective" measures has been challenged. Since test scores are sometimes used to assign students to classrooms, as with ability groupings, or associated with selection of students for schools where special programs are offered as incentives to desegregation, blacks and whites of unusually high ability may be concentrated in certain "desegregated" situations. If these situations are included as cases in the sample studied, achievement score changes will reflect selection processes rather than desegregation effects. Secondly, a number of studies have shown that these standardized tests are biased in favor of white middle-income children because the material covered by the tests is more likely to be familiar to those children than to minority group children (see Section IV. 3.c for more information on this argument). Others have suggested that achievement scores measure conceptual abilities which are developed through the interaction of parents with their children before they enter school rather than skills which the school itself is trying to teach and for which the school should be held accountable (see, for example, Shaycoft 1967). The importance of the question of how well achievement scores measure what is learned in schools has been recently underscored by the fact that desegregated blacks tend to do better than segregated blacks on math, but not verbal achievement scores. (For reports of studies which investigate these and other important variables with regard to achievement and desegregation, see Denmark

1970, St. John and Lewis 1971, and Mayer, et al. 1974.) Since math skills are learned primarily in school, math tests may more accurately reflect the effect of school conditions on achievement. These potentially contaiminating situations must be carefully controlled and the limitations of the measures used must be considered in evaluating reported changes in academic achievement with desegregation.

In general, studies have shown that black students' scores do not seem to be adversely affected by the desegregated situation and may improve substantially in certain circumstances. However, the achievement gap between black and white students remains and tends to increase with grade level. Overall, findings are mixed on the question of whether or not desegregation significantly improves the scores of black students. No adverse effects on whites' achievement scores have been reported except in cases where they attend predominantly black schools. However, changing background characteristics of the white population in predominantly black schools as a result of increased pressure to desegregate all public schools has not been carefully studied.

Surprisingly, little research effort has been expended on investigating the black-white ratio most favorable to improved black scores. Coleman, et al.'s data (1966) suggested that school social-class differences accounted for the effects of percentage white on achievement scores, but the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1967b) reported that when both family, school, and social class were controlled, blacks in majority white classrooms did significantly better. In an attempt to resolve this apparent contradiction, Cohen, Pettigrew, and Riley (1972) reanalyzed the EEOS data and found that the effect of school social-class was shared with the effect of racial composition, and the two could not be disentangled. Jencks and Brown (1975), in another reanalysis of EEOS, compared achievement test scores for first and sixth graders while controlling for racial composition. Findings suggested that the highest gains for both blacks and whites occurred in schools which were 51% to 75% white. However, blacks registered some gains in all schools where they comprised between 10% and 75% of the population.

Other factors which have recently been investigated for their effects on achievement scores include procedures for achieving desegregation (Armor 1972a and Pettigrew, et al. 1973) and the quality of teachers (see, for example, St. John 1971, and Hanushek 1972).

VI. 1.b. Educational Attainment. In evaluating the effects of desegregation on education, a few researchers have investigated the relationship between attendance at desegregated versus segregated schools and the number of years students stay in schools (educational attainment). Like those reported for the effects of desegregated on academic achievement, findings on educational attainment are inconclusive. There is some evidence to suggest that desegregated blacks and particularly those who enter desegregated schools at an early age are likely to attain more years of education than those who stay segregated, but there remains a substantial gap between median years of education for desegregated black versus white students (see, for example, Crain 1971 and Hanushek 1972).

Recently several researchers have suggested that whatever gains some black students in desegregated schools are making in educational attainment are more than offset by the increased number of black students who dropout, are pushed out or are expelled from desegregated schools, thus restricting their access to many jobs (see, for example, Watson 1975 and Armor 1972b). (For other factors which affect dropout and pushout rates for blacks, see Section VI. 3. Also see Section V. 5.b.) Results from the Coleman Survey indicate that high school dropout rates and college attendance are not related to social race when family background and test scores are controlled; however the research was conducted before large-scale desegregation was underway. Others have called into question the importance of number of years of formal education.

The perceived link between educational attainment and occupational attainment has been one of the factors underlying interest in how long children stay in school. This belief that formal educational attainment is a good predictor of income level or occupation was brought under suspicion by a highly publicized analysis of the Coleman data by Jencks, et al. (1972). That study demonstrates the difficulty in trying to establish a direct relationship between years in school and eventual income level. Jencks, et al. argued that equalizing educational attainment will not alleviate the economic inequality existing between blacks and whites in the United States today. These findings and their interpretation have been subjected to much criticism including the fact that some high-paying jobs require little formal education, while at the same time some very low-paying jobs, such as teaching, require considerable education. Despite the criticisms, the Jencks, et al. position has served to weaken the beliefs of those who support education as a means of reducing inequality and stratification in America.

VI. 2. Psychological Outcomes

Though not as extensively researched as educational outcomes, the psychological effects of school desegregation have always been considered important. The 1954 *Brown* decision was supported in part by reports of a number of social scientists who indicated in their findings that school segregation produced a detrimental psychological effect on black children. Concern over the psychological costs of desegregation is still being voiced, particularly in regard to token blacks or whites in "desegregated" schools (see, for example, Rist 1976).

As has been characteristic of work on other outcomes, attempts at integrating the material on psychological effects has been hampered by differences in research design and the biases of researchers working in the field. Some have stressed improving aspects of personality as ends in themselves because they improve the state of black mental health, while others have focused on personality factors as they affect educational outcomes. Very little work has emphasized the role of peer groups on psychological outcomes. Theoretical issues such as the relationship among various intrapersonal characteristics and the extent to which social and educational conditions determine psychological outcomes remain unresolved.

The section has been divided into five portions which cover the major aspects of personality investigated in relation to desegregation. For a good recent review of what is known about the psychological impact of desegregation, see Epps 1975.

VI. 2.a. Orientation Toward Achievement. An early study which provided the basis for much of the later work on desegregation and achievement orientation was conducted by Rosen. Writing in 1959, he hypothesized that different social mobility rates for black and white adults could be explained by dissimilar orientations toward achievement. These different orientations were thought to come about as a result of differing socialization patterns in the home. Rosen broke down what he called the "achievement syndrome" into three elements: motivation or inclination to achieve, values which guide preferences and goals, and educational and occupational aspirations. Rosen found that blacks scored as high or higher than whites on educational aspirations and that both placed a high value on achievement, but blacks scored much lower on motivation to achieve. Rosen concluded that the reality of segregation for blacks had not encouraged the development of behavior patterns which would lead to achievement of desired goals.

This framework for conceptualizing the relationship between psychological and social factors which contribute to "success" was characteristic of much of the work which followed on the impact of desegregation on orientation toward achievement in schools. It was repeatedly found that most black parents aspired to the same or higher level of attainment for their children as did white parents (see, for example, Krysta, Chesler, and White 1967 and Smith, Flory, Bashshur, and Shannon 1967). The fact that black children seldom achieved those high goals was explained by the fact that black parents had been denied the opportunity to compete in the white-dominated sector of society, had not developed the behavioral mechanisms for success in the white world, and therefore could not train their children in them (see, for example, Katz 1967a).

In spite of the fact that differences in academic motivation were thought to exist between blacks and whites, the element of achievement orientation which has received the most attention with regard to desegregation is the different levels of educational and occupational aspirations of blacks and whites. Most studies of aspirations have been done on high school students through the use of questionnaires which ask about plans and expectations for the future. Findings have shown that black students in segregated schools tend to have higher aspirations than those in desegregated schools (see, for example, Armor 1972a, Bachman 1970). Blacks were found to be more likely to want to attend college but less likely to have taken steps to prepare themselves for college (see, for example, Coleman, et al. 1966). There is also evidence to suggest that blacks define their life chances in terms of the more restricted range of opportunities which have traditionally been available in the black community—such as attending black universities and training for jobs such as teachers, doctors, and ministers (see, for example, Falk and Cosby 1974).

The fact that aspirations seem to be higher for segregated blacks has led some researchers to hypothesize that the desegregated black student lowers his aspirations to a more realistic level because direct contact with whites provides him with a better understanding of the competition he must face to get through school successfully and to acquire a job. Some argue that reduced and more realistic aspirations should increase the academic motivation of black students (see, for example, Katz 1967a). It has been argued, on the other hand that contact with whites in a desegregated school demoralizes black students, thus reducing aspirations as well as motivation (see, for example, Bachman 1970). Tests of these hypotheses are inconclusive (see, for example, Hall and Wiant 1973, Veroff and Peele 1969). Still another approach to dealing with the apparent negative effect of desegregation on aspirations has been to link aspirations with an individual's sense of control over his environment. Coleman, et al. (1966) found that sense of control was greater for desegregated blacks. This finding has led some researchers to argue that increased sense of control compensates for lowered aspirations in motivating achievement. Increased satisfaction with school as expressed by desegregated blacks is another positive outcome which has been associated with increased academic motivation (see, for example, Williams and Venditti 1969).

VI. 2.b. Self-Concept. The study of how self-concept is affected by desegreation has been carried out under a number of names including self-confidence, self-image, and self-esteem. Self-concept as used here encompasses all of these and the concept is usually defined as the feelings one has about self which come about as a result of interaction with others.

Since the 1930's, psychologists have postulated that the social stigma attached to being black produced a low self-concept. Seward (1956) argued that skin color was an integral part of the concept of self. Studies of the development of racial awareness in children suggest that from the ages of three to seven, children are learning labels and affective connotations associated with social race groups (see Goodman 1964, Proshansky and Newton 1968). Clark and Clark (1947) demonstrated that both black and white children preferred white dolls over black dolls and that more positive character traits were associated with the white dolls. A large number of studies since that time have confirmed the Clarks' finding and have demonstrated the range of negative connotations which both whites and blacks associate with black skin color. (See, for example, Williams 1966; Williams, Best, Wood and Filler 1973, and Redisch and Weissback 1974; for a study of the resultant anxiety which blacks feel, see McDonald 1970.) A few recent studies have suggested that this tendency to associate black skin color and negative characteristics may no longer be as pronounced among either blacks or whites (see, for example, Brigham 1974). The need for elimination of the debilitating effects of segregation on self-concept was cited as evidence favoring desegregation in the 1954 *Brown* decision. It was hoped that desegregation of schools would improve black self-concepts.

Although some studies have indicated that direct contact between blacks and whites does increase self-concept and produce better cross-color understanding (see, for example, Coles 1963, 1967; Busk, Ford and Schulman 1973; and for positive results among adults, see Pettigrew 1969a). The composite findings show no significant differences in self-concept as a result of desegregation. St. John (1975) charts ten studies on self-concept which indicate that black self-concept decreases as percentage white in the classroom increases. (See especially Rosenberg and Simons 1970.) Coleman, et al. (1966) found that self-concept fell as a result of desegregation while sense of control over environment rose. McPartland's (1968) reanalysis of Coleman's data confirmed the finding and, as was the case with orientation toward achievement, sense of environmental control was posited as a positive outcome of desegregation which might compensate for lowered self-concept. It is also argued that the advantages of direct black-white contact on self-concept may be offset for blacks by fear of failure, perception of a very wide gap between ability levels, or feelings that probability of success in school is low because whites seem to perform better and have access to more status-rewarding activities.

Since self-concept is defined in terms of an individual's feeling about his status relative to those with whom he has contact, it seems likely that certain people will exert more influence on self-concept than others. Some researchers have begun to focus on how different reference groups or "audiences," such as parents, neighborhood peers, and teachers and classmates with which a child particularly identifies or associates contribute to self-concept outcomes. Epps (1975) aruges that societal status is superseded by status within a small reference group, especially for young children, and that they do not become aware of the stigma attached to being black until they confront whites at school, where whites receive more institutional rewards. A. Cohen (1968) argues that self-concept is dependent on a person's perception of how important he is to those around him. Thus, the perception that whites do better in school leads those blacks who do not have the skills to compete academically to turn to non-academic reference groups in which they can enjoy the rewards of importance and high status. In an interesting study, Shaw (1974) shows that black and white children differ with regard to aspects of self-concept. Blacks, for example, see themselves as more hostile and more independent than whites although overall black-white self-concept scores are not significantly affected by desegregation of the schools. Denmark (1970) reports that self-concepts of black males improve more than those for black females in a desegregated situation. She suggests this finding may be due to the fact that males can achieve higher status positions in the school, as in sports, which are not available to girls (see also Yarrow, Campbell and Yarrow 1958 for more on the special hardships encountered by desegregated girls).

VI. 2.c. Anxiety. From the outset, many social scientists have worried about the emotional strain which black children entering newly desegregated schools might feel. Certainly there were reasons for concern: black students would be entering schools as strangers and as perceived inferiors. St. John (1975) summarizes seven articles which report the relation of school desegregation to measured anxiety. Although a dominant concern of psychologists is the possible increase of emotional stress in black children with desegregation, St. John points out the rather inconclusive results of the studies. There generally is no significant relation between increased anxiety and desegregation which has been isolated (for examples of studies on anxiety and desegregation, see Mahan and Mahan 1971).

Studies by Coles (1967), Nash (1968), and Chesler and Segal (1970) document the fear and rejection which early black desegregators felt, especially in the South. Coles' findings suggest, however, that these initially stressful conditions were not permanently damaging psychologically to most of the children involved. Other studies have suggested that blacks are more anxious than whites about being accepted by peers and teachers at school (for brief summaries of the literature of these and other factors related to anxiety and desegregation, see O'Reilly 1970, Chapter 3).

Katz 1967a has suggested that the circumstances surrounding desegregation as well as treatment of black students in desegregated schools are particularly important in determining anxiety levels. He fears that once anxiety is produced as a result of feelings of rejection when blacks cannot compete in the white-dominated school, the motivation levels and thus the achievement levels of black children will further decline (for more on aspirations and motivations, see Subsection 2.a. above).

VI. 3. Social Outcomes

Desegregation has been supported by some blacks and other Civil Rights advocates as a means of alleviating gross discrimination against black minority group members in the United States. One of the original concerns of social scientists and others who advocated desegregated schools was the reduction of the social stigma attached to being black. Although there have been myriad small-scale studies of children's attitudes about and preferences for same- vs. cross-color association (stigma has been operationalized as racial attitudes), the question of whether or not cross-color contact in desegregated schools has produced the desired social outcome of reducing the stigma associated with being black remains equivocal. The findings are that racial attitudes are affected by desegregation but the direction of the change is unclear. Results of studies such as those by Yarrow, Campbell, and Yarrow (1958), Coles (1967), and Chesler and Segal (1970) suggest that prejudice is reduced while Dentler and Elkins' study (1967) finds that prejudice increases in a desegregated setting. St. John (1975) compared studies on social outcomes by grade level, research design, behavior vs. attitude studies, type of desegregation plan, and individual student characteristics and found only one consistent pattern in the findings: there is a general preference for same-color members as friends and work partners.

Pettigrew (1969b) has underscored the importance of the amount and type of interracial contact which takes places in a desegregated school. He argues that desired desegregated outcomes can occur only in school settings where interracial acceptance is espoused. In an attempt to explain the circumstances which contribute to positive interracial settings, recent attention has shifted away from a narrow view of the social outcomes as being changes in students' prejudicial attitudes about desegregation and toward investigation of a variety of indicators of the social milieu, including beliefs and preferences concerning interracial contact as well as behaviors which mark it. All participants in a school are seen as contributing to the social milieu through the attitudes they have about desegregation, different types of students, and the education process.

Some researchers (Leacock 1969, E. Cohen 1972b, for example) have drawn attention to the importance of the larger context for evaluating social outcomes. Community attitudes toward the school would be one such factor. Another researcher along a similar line, recently commented that the traditional classroom structure dominated by the teacher and stressing individual achievement may work against the development of close interpersonal relationships among students in general, thus limiting opportunity for positive social interaction which might reduce prejudice (Coleman 1976). In several instances, case studies have been used to investigate social milieu in desegregated schools (see, for example, Fuchs 1969 and Kimball and Wagley 1974; for the the same type of study on predominantly black schools, see Eddy 1967, Leacock 1969, and Rist 1973). These studies provide valuable information on how particular social milieu, especially the behavioral aspects, influence outcomes.

The subsections which follow are organized in terms of three principal indicators of interracial social milieu: cross-color beliefs, cross-color acceptance, and cross-color interaction patterns.

VI. 3.a. Cross-Color Beliefs. The study of cross-color beliefs has centered on the development of racial awareness, expectations of social race differences, and beliefs about appropriate interaction between blacks and whites. Very early studies established the fact that children recognize differences between blacks and whites, associate more negative traits with blacks than with whites and realize these distinctions as early as the age of three or four (see, for example, Criswell 1937, Clark and Clark 1947, and Goodman 1964). More recent studies suggest that these conclusions are still valid (see, for example, Porter 1971) and provide little new information.

Although the nature of the link has recently been questioned (see Sartain 1966), parents are generally believed to have an important influence on children's beliefs (see, for example, Clark 1955 and Proshansky and Newton 1967). Adult beliefs about desegregation have undergone reversals. Campbell and Hatchett (1976), for example, report that in 1964 the majority of whites in the U.S. were opposed to desegregation. By 1970 most whites favored it, but by 1974 only one-third of whites interviewed favored desegregation. The data on blacks shows that the majority has always favored desegregation although the percentage in favor had declined by 1974.

Peer groups have also been thought to have a significant effect on beliefs. (See, for example, work by Crockett 1957 and Alexander and Campbell 1964 for the effect of peer groups on decisions by blacks to attend predominantly white schools.) Peer group factors, however, have not been carefully studied. Similarly, the changing influence of parents and peers on beliefs during the course of the school career has not been systematically studied (St. John 1975).

VI. 3.b. Cross-Color Acceptance. Research on outcomes of cross-color acceptance usually involves the investigation of changes in the extent of prejudiced, biased, or stereotypic attitudes as a result of desegregation. In response to the early findings of racial stereotyping and awareness among young children (Clark and Clark 1947, Goodman 1964), the reduction of racial prejudice became a highly valued outcome of the desegregation of schools. However, it has been researched in only a limited manner.

Although some contend that attitudes mediate behavior (see, for example, Carithers 1970), the extent to which verbally expressed racial prejudice, such as the association of negative character traits to black dolls, is important to actual interracial behavior has never been empirically determined. A number of studies suggest that there is very little correspondence (see, for example, Porter 1971).

Sartain (1966) found no clear connection between parental and child attitudes, but there was a close correlation between children's attitudes and the attitudes children reported for their parents. This finding suggests the need to look at perceptions of cross-color attitudes rather than self-designated attitudes as a measure of social outcomes. Evidence for this need is provided by McDowell (1967) who found that black willingness to establish cross-color relationships was directly related to anticipation of a positive reaction by whites to the association.

Although a number of studies have shown that the extent of prejudicial attitudes varies with family background and individual characteristics such as sex, social class, and lightness of skin color, (see, for example, Gottlieb and TenHouten 1965, Porter 1971, and Lewis and St. John 1974), most researchers continue to assume that same-color children, especially whites, hold similar negative attitudes and then proceed to measure these attitudes without controlling for relevant background factors.

Generally, the findings on cross-color acceptance are mixed. For evidence of less racial acceptance after desegregation, see Campbell (1958), Armor (1972a), and Green and Gerard (1974); for evidence of better interracial attitudes see Gardner, et al. 1970, Sachdeva 1973. One trend in the findings is that blacks tend to become more tolerant of whites while whites become less tolerant of blacks in the desegregated school (see, for example, Chesler and Segal 1970, and Herman 1970).

Some researcher have tried to identify circumstances which engender reduced levels of prejudice. Koslin, et al. (1972) found that interracial attitudes were more favorable when classrooms were composed of approximately equal numbers of black and white students. Although black and white friendship choices were still less than would be expected by chance, there was significantly less racial polarization in the classroom and more cross-color friendships were noted. There is some indication that length of time in a desegregated school encourages a positive outcome (McParland 1968). This finding lends support to those who argue that desegregation in the early grades is essential because racial prejudice is not yet firmly established and change can be more easily effected. This trend is further substantiated by research indicating that blacks and whites who live in desegregated residential areas and who have attended desegregated schools have very low prejudice levels (see, for example, Crain 1968).

Considering the likelihood of its importance to black-white relations in schools, the question of cross-color acceptance of teachers by students has been only slightly researched. What evidence there is suggests that black students feel closer to and are more accepting of black teachers and that the presence of black teachers and other staff members in the school may reduce black drop-out rates and alienation (see, for example, Riccio and Barner 1973, Darkenwald 1975 and Erickson 1975).

VI. 3.c. Cross-Color Interaction Patterns. The data on cross-color interaction in desegregated situations come almost exclusively from sociometric tests of association. These tests ask children to name their friends or schoolmates with whom they prefer to work or play. Although these tests do not measure actual behavior, choice of work or play mates is considered an indication of a predisposition to interact with particular individuals. The use of sociometric tests has been questioned on a number of grounds; some have argued that it is similar beliefs or perceived ability to accomplish a task and not race which influences friendship choices (see, for example Hendricks, et al. 1973). Another problem with the use of sociometric tests has been the failure in some cases to correct for the probability of same-group preference as racial percentages in the classroom change (St. John 1975). Comparatively few researchers have studied interaction patterns by direct observation of children in schools. Studies of cross-color behavior are different from other studies of desegregation outcomes in the sense that patterns cannot be compared between segregated and desegregated schools but only in schools where black and white children have contact with each other.

The picture of desegregation outcomes is no less clouded by a look at the findings on interaction patterns. Generally, interracial associations are few (see for example Silverman and Shaw 1973). Results are variable depending on the racial percentages in the classroom: as the percentage of the minority group increases, sociometric tests show more cross-color choices but same-color preference or racial polarization remains pronounced (see for example Fox 1966; Koslin, et al. 1972; and St. John and Lewis 1975). This general trend of color-restricted friendship choices, particularly as minorities become more isolated in the classroom, seems important to other desegregation outcomes. For example, Webster and Kroger (1966) reported that more cross-color friendships were associated with higher self-concept, while Coleman, et al. (1966) and St. John and Lewis (1975) report a relationship between more cross-race friendships and higher academic achievement.

In studies of actual observed behavior, there seems to be more informal and spontaneous interracial association in elementary schools than in high schools where black-white associations occur only in the context of formal classroom or extracurricular activities (Dwyer 1958, St. John 1964). Kimball and Wagley (1974) found that blacks and whites in high schools developed parallel systems of extracurricular activities while Gottlieb and TenHouten (1965) suggest that the amount and the type of black participation in school activities depends on the social race composition of the school: when blacks are in a small minority, they generally do not participate in school activities; as percentage black increases, separate systems develop; and where blacks constitute a majority as a result of white flight, blacks assume roles in all activities. Others have noted the effects of teacher attitudes and classroom procedures on black-white behavior, suggesting the need for attention to producing social climates which will encourage positive interaction (see for example Crain 1973, Frenk 1973, King and Mayer 1973, Cusick 1974, and Gay 1974).

Investigating the aspects of the social climate produced when blacks and whites interact in a laboratory setting, Katz and Benjamin (1960) and E. Cohen (1972a) found that black-white interaction was often characterized by white dominance, suggesting that social status differences discouraged blacks from interacting with whites. They theorized that this situation could be improved by establishing "equal status" relationships between members of the two groups. A positive change in interaction style was affected by training which raised expectations for black performance. Although more difficult to implement in the classroom, measures such as this point to ways in which teachers can effect positive interaction results among their students (for information on similar studies emphasizing cooperative behaviors, see Roper 1971 and Silverthorne, et al. 1974).

VI. 4. A Curious Discrepancy

As initially conceived, one of the purposes of school desegregation was the elimination of the stigmatization of black children. Stigmatization was seen as a social process involving the restriction of black children to low-status schools. Most researchers who have chosen to study the outcomes of desegregation, however, have tended to conceptualize their task as studying the effects of cross-color schoolmates upon the individual. Group-level outcomes have received much less attention. As a result, little is known concerning the degree to which the social stigma of being black is reinforced in desegregated schools. The manner in which social race is responded to in the social order established in desegregated schools is also unknown. Sociometric and observational studies such as that of Kimball and Wagley (1974) suggest that in many desegregated schools black and white students tend to form separate activity systems and social networks. It is also evident from court cases on tracking and suspensions, that an inordinate number of black children wind up in lower tracks and are ejected from schools - suggesting the operation of certain stratification processes. E. Cohen (1972a, 1975), one of the few researchers concerned with desegregated situations who has developed and refined the concept of stigmatization to any extent, has provided both laboratory data and a theoretical context which suggest that these social processes deserve attention. (See also Pettigrew 1975.)

A number of researchers have drawn attention to the importance of social processes in the structuring of learning in schools, although not particularly in desegregated schools. Willover, et al. (1973), for example, notes the connection between teachers' perceptions of the type of student body and the form of control or classroom management they employ. He suggests that the greater the perceived problem posed by the students, the more likely the teacher will be to impose custodial management on some student or on whole classrooms. In doing so the teacher is also responding to the feelings of the principal, other teachers, and the community concerning control procedures. Early studies which focused on academic standards as a measure of change resulting from desegregation, found that teachers' ideas about the academic standards of their schools were lowered after desegregation (see, for example, Wey and Corey 1959). Studies of expectations have shown that teachers do perceive certain groups of students more negatively than others and treat them differently (see, for example, Rist 1973). Leacock (1969) reports that teachers of middle-income students tend to blame themselves when students perform poorly, while teachers of lower-class students blame the students. These findings suggest that black students may be exposed to management techniques which differ from those imposed on whites, with resulting differences in educational outcomes. (For a related study on the effects of different social situations on the handling of discipline problems, see Nicholas, Virgo, and Wattenberg 1965.)

Leacock suggests that the way in which the teacher structures student involvement will determine what is learned. Her suggestion is borne out by the work of Talbert (1970) and

Rist (1973) who show how teachers can exclude children as participants in learning through interaction rates and seating arrangements. Leacock herself finds that the techniques used by some teachers implicitly reinforce stereotypes which the white society has traditionally applied to blacks.

The possibility of reestablishment of segregated patterns in the classroom and the social mechanisms which channel learning would seem to be appropriate questions for researchers interested in investigating the outcomes of desegregation and explaining differences in educational opportunities (outcomes). In some ways it seems curious that so little attention has been devoted to these areas. Clark (1973) has suggested that attention to explanations of educational outcomes for blacks in terms of depressed conditions rather than social stigmatization, has developed for political or social reasons. A more mundane reason might also be suggested. Certain research methodologies have tended to predominate in the study of desegregation outcomes and in the study of factors affecting educational outcomes. These methods of survey and testing suggest that the social and cultural context of desegregation is thoroughly understood and that the crucial variables have been identified or at least suggested by a theory. On the contrary, desegregation research has been characterized instead by a lack of basis either in theory on in grounded information on which to develop informed research questions. This lopsided perspective has included relatively few intensive studies and relatively little attention to theoretical frameworks.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This review of trends in school desegregation and educational inequality literature was prepared for the National Institute of Education pursuant to Contract No. 400-76-0008.

We would like to give credit to others who assisted us in the preparation of the review. Joanne Taylor drafted Sections V.5.c. and V.5.d. Linda Catron assisted with the preparation of Section V.2.c. and provided clerical assistance. Others who helped with the massive amount of clerical work involved in the project are Mary Boyer, Mary Ann Emmons, David Howe, and Audra Kroah. We would like to especially thank Joe Harding who provided valuable editorial assistance.

VII. REFERENCES

Aarons, Alfred C., Barbara Y. Gordon, and William A. Stewart
1969 Linguistic-Cultural Differences and American Education. Special Anthropology Issue, The Florida FL Reporter 7(1). Miami: Florida FL Reporter. (V.5.d)

Abrams, Roger I.
1975 Not One Judge's Opinion: *Morgan* v. *Hennigan* and the Boston Schools. Harvard Educational Review 45(1):5-16. (III.1.c)

Adams, A. John, and Joan Martin Burke
1970 Civil Rights: A Current Guide to the People, Organizations, and Events. New York: R. R. Bowker Company. (III.3.)
An encyclopedia-like listing of civil rights leaders, and organizations and events 1955-1970. A 1974 edition, originally prepared as a quick reference for CBS News, is also available.

Alabama Council on Human Relations
1972 It's Not Over in the South: School Desegregation in Forty-Three Southern Cities Eighteen Years After *Brown*. Washington, D.C.: Southern Education Foundation. (IV.1)

Alexander, C. N., Jr., and E. Q. Campbell
1964 Peer Influences on Adolescent Educational Aspirations and Attainments. American Sociological Review 29:568-75. (VI.3.a)

Alexander, George J.
1963 Civil Rights, U.S.A. Public Schools—Cities in the North and West, 1963, Buffalo, ERIC: ED001942. (IV.1)

Altschuler, Alan A.
1970 Community Control: The Black Demand for Participation in Large American Cities. New York: Pegasus. (V.3)

Anastasi, Anne
1964 Culture—Fair Testing. Educational Horizons (43):26-30. (IV.3.c)

Armor, David J.
1972a The Evidence on Busing. The Public Interest 28:90-126. (V.1.c; VI.1.a; VI.3.b)
1972b School and Family Effects on Black and White Achievement: A Reexamination of the USOE Data. *In* On Equality of Educational Opportunity. F. Mosteller and D. P. Moynihan, Eds. New York: Random House. (VI.1.b; VI.2.a)

Arnez, Nancy L.
1973 Partners in Urban Education: Teaching the Inner-City Child. Morristown, N.J.: Silver Burdett Division, General Learning Corporation. (V.5.e)

Askew, Reubin O'D.
1972 Busing is Not the Issue. Inequality in Education 11(March):3-5. (V.1.c)

Ausubel, David P.
1964 How Reversible are the Cognitive and Motivational Effects of Cultural Deprivation? Implications for Teaching the Culturally Deprived Child. Urban Education 1 (Summer):16-38. (IV.3.a)

Bachman, Gerald G.
1970 Youth in Transition, Volume 2. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan. (VI.2.a)

Banaka, William H., et al.
1971 Training People in the Public Schools to Run Interracial Sensitivity Groups: A Graduate Program. Papers presented at Western Psychological Association Convention, San Francisco, CA. April, 1971. (V.5.3)

Banks, James A.
1972 The Destruction of Black Schools: An American Tragedy. Educational Leadership 30(3):269-71. (II.3.)

Banks, James A., Ed.
1973 Teaching Ethnic Studies: Concepts and Strategies. 43rd Yearbook, National Council for the Social Studies. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies. (V.5.d)

Baratz, Joan C.
1975 Court Decisions and Educational Change: A Case History of the D. C. Public Schools, 1954-1974. *In* From *Brown* to *Bradley*: School Desegregation 1954-1974. R. Stephen Browning, Ed. Cincinnati: Jefferson Law Book Company. pp. 63-80. (V.5)

Baratz, Stephen S., and Joan C. Baratz
1970 Early Childhood Intervention: The Social Science Base of Institutional Racism. Harvard Educational Review 40(1);29-50. (IV.3.a; V.5.c)

Battle, Haron, J.
1973 State Involvement in the Urban Education Crisis. Journal of Negro Education 42(3):315-321. (V.1.d)

Bell, Derrick A., Jr.
1970 School Litigation Strategies for the 1970's: New Phases in the Continuing Quest for Quality Schools. Wisconsin Law Review 1970: 257-297. (II.3)
Bell describes the frustrations engendered among blacks using the courts as a primary means of securing quality education. He suggests alternatives to school desegregation such as demands for black control and establishment of private schools for black children now in inner-city schools.

1975a Running and Busing in Twentieth Century America. *In* From *Brown* to *Bradley*: School Desegregation 1954-1974. R. Stephen Browning, Ed. Cincinnati: Jefferson Law Book Co. pp. 214-217. (III.1.a)

1975b Waiting on the Promise of *Brown*. Law and Contemporary Problems 39(2):341-373. (II.3; III.1.a)
Written in the form of a response to a black community group desiring equal educational opportunity for their children, this article counsels that the community investigate alternatives. Extensive footnotes guide readers to cases wherein courts have ruled on the various resistance tactics (e.g., segregated private schools) and the legality of various alternatives such as community control.

Bernstein, Basil
1961 Social Class and Linguistic Development: A Theory of Social Learning. *In* Education, Economy and Society. A. H. Halsey, J. Floud, and C. A. Anderson,

Eds. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc. pp. 288-314. (IV.3.a)

Billings, Charles E.

1972 Community Control of the School and the Quest for Power, Phi Delta Kappan 53(5):277-278. (II.3)

Binderman, Murray B.

1972 The Failure of Freedom of Choice: Decision-Making in a Southern Black Community. Social Forces 50(4):487-498. (V.1.a)

Blaustein, Albert P., and Clarence Clyde Ferguson, Jr.

1954 Desegregation and the Law: The Meaning and Effect of the School Segregation Cases. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press. (III.1.b)

Bloom, Benjamin S., Allison David, and Robert Hess

1965 Compensatory Education for Cultural Deprivation. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. (IV.3.a)

Brace, C. Loring, George Gamble, and Terry Bond, Eds.

1971 Race and Intelligence. Anthropological Studies, No. 8. Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association. (IV.3.b)

Braden, Anne

1958 The Wall Between. New York: Monthly Review Press. (V.2.a)

Brain, George B., et al.

1963 School Superintendents Conference on the Practical Problems of Public School Desegregation. Baltimore, MD: City Public Schools. (V.1)

Brigham, John C.

1974 Views of Black and White Children Concerning the Distribution of Personality Characteristics. Journal of Personality 42(1):145-158. (VI.2.b)

Brophy, Jere E., and Thomas L. Good

1970 Teachers' Communication of Differential Expectations for Children's Classroom Performance: Some Behavioral Data. Journal of Educational Psychology 61(5):365-374. (IV.3.c)

1974 Teacher-Student Relationships: Causes and Consequences. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc. (IV.3.c)

Brown, Cynthia, and Marlene Provizer

1972 The South's New Dual School System: a Case Study. New South 27(4):59-72. (V.2.b)

Bryson, Seymour, and John T. Mouw

1973 Race, Understanding, and Counseling. Integrated Education 11(4-5): 64-67. (V.5.e)

Burger, Henry G.

1968 "Ethno-Pedagogy"; a Manual in Cultural Sensitivity. With Techniques for Improving Cross-Cultural Teaching by Fitting Ethnic Patterns. Albuquerque: Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, Inc. (Publication No. 2-0768). (v.5.e)

Burnett, Jacquetta H.

1974 Anthropology and Education: An Annotated Bibliography Guide. Council on Anthropology and Education. New Haven: Human Relations Area Files. (I.2)

Burt, Lorin A., and S. Kern Alexander

1969 The Legal Status of the Neighborhood School. *In* Integration and Education. David W. Beggs and S. Kern Alexander, Eds. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company. pp. 107-120. (V.3)

Busk, Patricia L., R. C. Ford, and J. L. Schulman

1973 Effects of Schools' Racial Composition on the Self-Concept of Black and White Students. Journal of Educational Research 67(2):57-63. (VI.2.b)

Cahn, Edmond

1955 Jurisprudence. New York University Law Review 30 (January):150-169. (III.4)

Caliguri, Joseph P.

1970 Suburban Interracial Education Projects. A Resource Booklet. Kansas City, MO: Missouri University, Office of Education. (V.5.e)

Camp, C. William, et al.

1969 Evaluation of the Portland-Suburban Transfer Program, 1968-69 Multnomah County, Oregon. Eugene, OR: Oregon University, Bureau of Educational Research. (V.1)

Campbell, Angus, and Shirley Hatchett

1976 Racial Attitude Trends: 1964-1974.

Integrated Education 14(1): 40-42. (VI.3.a)

Campbell, E. Q.

1958 Some Social Psychological Correlates of Direction of Attitude Change. Social Forces 36:335-40. (VI.3.b)

Campbell, Roald F.

1967 Federal-State Educational Relations. Phi Delta Kappan 49(1):16-20. (III.2.c)

Campbell, Roald F., and Donald H. Layton

1968 Thrust and Counterthrust in Education Policy Making. Phi Delta Kappan 49(6):290-294. (III.2.c)

Carithers, Martha W.

1970 School Desegregation and Racial Cleavage, 1954-1970: A Review of the Literature. Journal of Social Issues 26(4):25-47. (VI.3.b)

Carter, Robert L.

1955 Legal Background and Significance of the May 17th Decision. Social Problems 2(4):215-219. (III.1.b)

Cazden, Courtney B., Vera P. John, and Dell Hymes, Eds.

1972 Functions of Language in the Classroom. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University. (IV.3.a)

Chachkin, Norman J.

1972 Metropolitan School Desegregation: Evolving Law. Integrated Education 10(2):13-26. (III.1.c)

Champagne, Anthony M.

1973 The Segregation Academy and the Law. Journal of Negro Education 42(1):58-66. (III.1.f)

Chesler, Mark

1967 "What Happened After You Desegregated the White School?" Atlanta Southern Regional Council, Inc. (V.2.a)

Chesler, Mark, and Phyllis Segal

1970 Southern Negroes' Initial Experiences and Reactions in School Desegregation. *In* Contemporary Issues in Educational Psychology. H. F. Clarizio, R. C. Craig, and W. A. Mehrens, Eds. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc. pp. 709-720. (VI.2.c; VI.3; VI.3.b)

Clark, Kenneth B.

1955 Prejudice and Your Child. Boston: Beacon Press. (VI.3.a)

1959 The Desegregation Cases: Criticism of the Social Scientist's Role. Villanova Law Review 5:224-226. (III.4)

Clark's response to critics of his role in *Brown*.

1962 Progress and problems from the Social Scientist's Viewpoint. ERIC: EDO14514. (IV.1)

1965 Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Power, New York: Harper and Row. (III.4)

Analysis of ghetto life based in part on Clark's years of study as chief project consultant and chairman of the board of directors of the planning stage of Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited.

1972a Eighteen Years After *Brown*. Integrated Education 10(6):7-15. (V.1; IV.1)

1972b Public School Desegregation in the Seventies. New South 27(3): 21-28. (IV.1)

1973 Social Policy, Power and Social Science Research. *In* Perspectives on Inequality. Harvard Educational Review, Ed. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review. (III.4: VI.4)

Clark, K. B., and M. P. Clark

1947 Racial Identification and Preference in Negro Children. *In* Readings in Social Psychology. T. M. Newcomb and E. L. Hartley, Eds. New York: Henry Holt. VI.2.b; VI.3.a; VI.3.b)

1950 Emotional Factors in Racial Identification and Preference in Negro Children. Journal of Negro Education 19:341-350. (VI)

Clark, Todd

1970 Integration, The First Year: A Role-Playing Simulation on School Integration. ERIC: ED050215. (V.5.e)

Clarke, Lillian W.

1973 Race and Suspensions in New Orleans. Integrated Education 11(3): 30-33. (V.5.b)

Cohen, Arthur R.

1968 Some Implications of Self-Esteem for Social Influence. *In* The Self in Social Interaction. C. Gordon and K. Gergen, Eds. New York: J. Wiley and Sons. pp. 383-390. (VI.2.b)

Cohen, David K.

1968 Policy for the Public Schools: Compensation and Integration. Harvard Educational Review 38(1):114-137. (II.2)
Utilizes existing research to assess the possible outcomes for alternative national policies on integration versus segregated compensatory education.

1969 The Price of Community Control. Commentary 48(1):23-32. (II.3; V.3)

1972 Compensatory Education. *In* Rethinking Urban Education. Herbert J. Walberg and Andrew T. Kopan, Eds. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc. pp. 150-164. (IV.3.a; V.5.c)

1974 Segregation, Desegregation, and *Brown*. Transaction: Social Science and Modern Society 12(1):34-41. (II.2; III.1.b; III.1.d)

Cohen, David K., and Michael S. Garet

1975 Reforming Educational Policy with Applied Social Research. Harvard Educational Review 45(1):17-43. (III.4)
An interpretation of the relationship between applied research and social policy using as case examples educational programs stimulated by the federal government.

Cohen, David K., T. F. Pettigrew, and R. T. Riley

1972 Race and the Outcomes of Schooling. *In* On Equality of Educational Opportunity. Frederick Mosteller and Daniel P. Moynihan, Eds. New York: Random House. (VI.1.a)

Cohen, Elizabeth G.

1972a Interracial Interaction Disability. Human Relations 25:9-24. (V.5; VI.4)

1972b Sociology and the Classroom: Setting the Conditions for Teacher Student Interaction. Review of Educational Research 42:441-452. (VI.3)

1975 The Effects of Desegregation on Race Relations. Law and Contemporary Problems 39(2):271-299. (VI.4)

Cole, Michael, and Silvia Scribner

1974 Culture and Thought: A Psychological Introduction. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc. (IV.3.a; IV.3.c)

Coleman, Andrew M.

1972 "Scientific" Racism and the Evidence on Race and Intelligence. Race 14(2):137-153. (IV.3.b)

Coleman, James S.

1968 The Concept of Equality of Educational Opportunity. Harvard Educational Review 38(1):7-22. (II.2)
Coleman traces the historical roots of the concept of equal educational opportunity and its evolution to the present.

1975 Racial Segregation in the Schools: New Research with Policy Implications. Phi Delta Kappan (Oct): 75-78. (II.2; IV.1; V.1.d; V.2.d)
Summarizes research findings and policy recommendations he reported in Trends in Schools Segregation, 1968-1973; findings suggest that efforts to desegregate large urban districts may lead to increases in interdistrict segregation; policy implications are considered.

1976 The Ways of Socialization. The Center Magazine 9(3):3-10. (IV.1; VI.3)

Coleman, James S., et al.

1966 Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office. (II.2; III.1.d; III.4; IV.1; IV.2; IV.3; V.3; VI.1; VI.1.a; VI.2.a; VI.2.b; VI.3.c)

Coleman, James S., S. P. Kelly, and J. Moore

n.d. Trends in School Segregation, 1968-1973. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute. (IV.1; V.2.c)

Coles, Robert

1963 The Desegregation of Southern Schools: A Psychiatric Study. *In* Integration vs. Segregation. Hubert A. Humphrey, Ed. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company. pp. 201-229. (VI.2.b)

1967 Children of Crisis: A Study of Courage and Fear. Boston: Little, Brown. (V.2.a; VI.2.b; VI.2.c; VI.3)

Conant, James B.

1961 Slums and Suburbs: A Commentary on Schools in Metropolitan Areas. New York: New American Library. (III.4)
Depicts educational problems in city schools as contrasted with those in suburban schools. Attributes difficulties to the

influx of low-income, poorly educated blacks into schools the resources of which were dwindling.

Congress of Racial Equality

1973 A Proposal for Community School Districts. *In* The Great School Bus Controversy. Nicolaus Mills, Ed. New York: Teachers College Press. (II.3)

Coons, J., W. Clune, and S. Sugarman

1970 Private Wealth and Public Education. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press. (III.1.c; III.1.d)

Crain, Robert L.

1968 The Politics of School Desegregation: Comparative Case Studies of Community Structure and Policy-Making. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company. (V.2.a; VI.3.b)

1971 School Integration and the Academic Achievement of Negroes. Sociology of Education 44:1-26. (VI.1.b)

Crain, Robert L., Ed.

1973 Southern Schools: An Evaluation of the Effects of the Emergency School Assistance Program and of School Desegregation. Volume I. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center. (III.2.c; VI.3.c)

Craven, J. Braxton, Jr.

1975 The Impact of Social Science Evidence on the Judge: A Personal Comment. Law and Contemporary Problems 39(1):150-157. (III.4)

Reviews the use of social science data in court cases and his opinion of the benefits and detriments of using such data.

Criswell, J. H., Jr.

1937 Racial Cleavage in Negro-White Groups. Sociometry 1:81-89. (VI.3.a)

Crockett, Harry J.

1957 A Study of Some Factors Affecting the Decision of Negro High School Students to Enroll in Previously All-White High Schools, St. Louis, 1955. Social Forces 35(4):351-356. (V.1.a; VI.3.a)

Cusick, Philip A., and Richard J. Ayling

1974 Biracial Interaction in an Urban Secondary School. School Review 82(3): 486-494. (VI.3.c)

Daheim, David

1965 Intergroup Education. Seattle Public Schools, Seattle, WA: Seattle Public Schools. (V.5.d)

Darkenwald, Gordon G.

1975 Some Effects of the 'Obvious Variable': Teacher's Race and Holding Power with Black Adult Students. Sociology of Education 48:420-431. (V.4.b; VI.3.b)

Davey, A. G.

1973 Teachers, Race, and Intelligence. Race 15(2):195-211. (IV.3.b)

Day, Richard, E., et al.

1963 Civil Rights, U.S.A. Public Schools—Southern States, 1963 North Carolina. ERIC: ED001930. (V; V.1.a)

This discusses the Pupil Assignment Act, which transferred authority of pupil assignment to local school boards, and the Pearsall Plan, which provided "safety valves" to assure escape possibilities for intolerable situations in school segregation. Both of these plans were used in North Carolina.

De'Ath, Colin, Michael Gibbons, and Ernest O'Neil

1969 Black Education and Black Society in the United States: A Bibliography for Development Educators. Occasional Paper. Pittsburgh, PA: International and Development Education Program, School of Education, University of Pittsburgh. (I.2)

Demarest, Sylvia M., and John F. Jordan

1975 *Hawkins* v. *Coleman*: Discriminatory Suspensions and the Effect of Institutional Racism on School Discipline. Inequality in Education 20(July):25-41. (V.5.b)

Demark, Florence L.

1970 The Effects of Integration on Academic Achievement and Self-Concept. Integrated Education 8:34-42. (VI.1.a; VI.2.b)

Dentler, Robert A.

1965 Community Behavior and Northern School Desegregation. Journal of Negro Education 34(3):258-267. (V.2.a)

Dentler, R. A., and C. Elkins

1967 Intergroup Attitudes, Academic Performance, and Racial Composition. *In* The Urban R's. R. A. Dentler, B. Mackler, and M. E. Warshauer, Eds. New York: Frederick A. Praeger. (VI.3)

Deutsch, Cynthia P.

1967 Auditory Discrimination and Learning: Social Factors. *In* The Disadvantaged Child: Selected Papers of Martin Deutsch and Associates. M. Deutsch, Ed. New York: Basic Books, Inc. pp. 259-277. (IV.3.a)

Deutsch, Martin P.

1967a Dimensions of the School's Role in the Problems of Integration. *In* The Disadvantaged Child. M. Deutsch, Ed. New York: Basic Books, Inc. pp. 281-294. (V.5)

1967b The Disadvantaged Child and the Learning Process. *In* The Disadvantaged Child: Selected Papers of Martin Deutsch and Associates. M. Deutsch, Ed. New York: Basic Books, Inc. pp. 39-57. (IV.3.a)

Deutsch, Martin P., and B. Brown

1964 Social Influence in Negro-White Intelligence Differences. Journal of Social Issues 20(2):24-35. (IV.3.a)

Dewing, Rolland

1968 Teacher Organizations and Desegregation. Phi Delta Kappan 49(5): 257-260. (V.4.b)

Dillard, J. L.

1973 Black English: Its History and Usage in the United States. New York: Vintage Books. (V.5.d)

Dodson, Dan W.

1965 School Administration, Control and Public Policy Concerning Integration. Journal of Negro Education 34(3):249-257. (V.3)

Durham, Joseph T.

1973 Sense and Nonsense About Busing. Journal of Negro Education 42(3):322-335. (V.1.c)

Dwyer, Robert J.

1958 A Report on Patterns of Interaction in Desegregated Schools. Journal of Educational Sociology 31(7):253-256. (VI.3.c)

Eddy, Elizabeth M.

1967 Walk the White Line. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday and Company Inc. (VI.3)

1975 Educational Innovation and Desegregation: A Case Study of Symbolic Realignment. Human Organization 34(2):163-172. (V.5; V.5.e)

Edmonds, Ronald

1973 Judicial Assumptions on the Value of Integrated Education for Blacks. *In* Race, Racism and American Law. D. Bell, Jr., Ed. Boston: Little, Brown and Company. (II.2)

Edmonds, Ronald, et al.

1973 A Black Response to Christopher Jenck's Inequality and Certain Other issues. *In* Perspectives on Inequality. Harvard Educational Review, Ed. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review. (III.4)

Egerton, John

1967 When Desegregation Comes, The Negro Principals Go. Southern Education Report 3(5):8-12. (V.4.b)

Eidenberg, Eugene, and Roy D. Morey

1969 An Act of Congress: The Legislative Process and the Making of Education Policy. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc. (III.2.c)

Details events preceding the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and its subsequent modifications in 1966 and 1967. The controversy over federal aid to education prior to 1965 is also analyzed in terms of policy development processes.

Elkind, D.

1969 Preschool Education. Childhood Education 45:321-328. (V.5.c)

Epps, Edgar C.

1975 The Impact of School Desegregation on Aspirations, Self-Concepts and Other Aspects of Personality. Law and Contemporary Problems 39(2): 300-313. (VI.2; VI.2.b)

Erickson, Frederick

1975 Gatekeeping and the Melting Pot: Interaction in Counseling Encounters. Harvard Educational Review 45(1):44-70. (VI.3.b)

Falk, William W., and A. G. Cosby
1974 School Desegregation and the Educational Projections of Rural Black Youth. Rural Sociology 39(1): 28-41. (VI.2.a)

Farley, Reynolds
1976 Is Coleman Right? Social Policy 6(4):14-23. (IV.1; V.2.c)

Feagin, Joe R.
1971 White Separatists and Black Separatists: A Comparative Analysis. Social Problems 19(2):167-180. (II.4) Discussion of historical and contemporary models of the preferred goals of interethnic and interrace adjustment, focusing on separatist models. Contains references to classical historical treatment of black-white relations in the United States and the related movements which arose. Feagin analyzes 1968 data to ascertain degree of support for separatist models among blacks and whites.

Feldstein, Sylvan, and Bernard Mackler
1969 De Facto School Segregation in the North: The Case of "In re Skipwith". Howard Law Journal 15(3):382-421. (III.1.c)

Fielder, Marie, and Louise M. Dyckman
1967 Leadership Training Institute in Problems of School Desegregation. Berkeley: University of California, Office of Education. (V.5.e)

Finn, Jeremy D.
1972 Expectations and the Educational Environment. Review of Educational Research 42(3):387-410. (IV.3.c)

Fischer, John H.
1964 Can Administrators Justify Neighborhood Schools—If Those Schools Have the Effect of Creating or Continuing Segregation? Nation's Schools 73(2):46-47, 86. (V.3)
1967 The School Park. *In* Educational Parks, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Clearinghouse Publication No. 9. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. (V.1.b)

Flannery, J. Harold
1972 School Desegregation Law: Recent Developments. Integrated Education 10(3):11-19. (III.1.c; III.1.e)

Fleming, E. and R. Anttonen
1971 Teacher Expectancy as Related to the Academic and Personal Growth of Primary-Age Children. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development 35(5 Serial No. 145). (IV.3.c)

Forbes, Jack D.
n.d. Afro-Americans in the Far West: A Handbook for Educators. Berkeley, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. (V.5.e)

Fort, J. G., J. C. Watts, and G. S. Lesser
1969 Cultural Background and Learning in Young Children. Phi Delta Kappan 50:386-88. (IV.3.a)

Foster, G. W., Jr.
1965 Title VI: Southern Education Faces the Facts. Saturday Review 48(March 20):60-61, 76-79. (III.2.b)

Fox, David J.
1966 Free Choice Open Enrollment—Elementary Schools. New York: Center for Urban Education. (VI.3.c)

Frenk, James H.
1973 The Influence of Non-White Pupil Classroom Composition on Classroom Quality. ERIC:ED 080629. (VI.3.c)

Fuchs, Estelle
1969 Teacher's Talk: Views From Inside City Schools. New York: Doubleday. (IV.3.a; IV.3.d; VI.3)

Gallimore, Ronald, et al.
1974 Culture, Behavior, and Education. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. (IV.3.d)

Gardner, Burleigh B., et al.
1970 The Effect of Busing Black Ghetto Children into White Suburban Schools. ERIC: ED048389. (VI.3.b)

Gay, Geneva
1974 Differential Dyadic Interactions of Black and White Teachers with Black and White Pupils in Recently Desegregated Social Studies Classrooms: A Function of Teacher and Pupil Ethnicity. Final Report. ERIC: ED091489. (VI.3.c)

Gibson, Morgan, et al.
1963 De Facto School Segregation in Milwaukee. Milwaukee: National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. (IV.1)

Giles, Raymond H., Jr.
1974 Black Studies Programs in Public Schools. Praeger Special Studies in U.S. Economic, Social, and Political Issues. New York: Praeger Publishers. (V.5.d) Examines the operation of various ethnic and black studies programs and their impact on racial attitudes. Includes data on elementary students' attitudes toward Africa after an African heritage program and a description and critique of representative case studies drawn from a survey of Afro-American studies programs throughout the country. An analysis of curriculum guides from 16 school districts identifies three distinct orientations to teaching black studies. Giles delineates criticisms of each of these approaches. For example, he is critical of ethnic studies used as a therapeutic alternative to reduce racial tension in place of needed examination of the motives and dynamics of the behaviors of certain white groups who have practiced racism with utmost effectiveness.

Gitell, Marilyn, and Alan G. Hevesi, Eds.
1969 The Politics of Urban Education. New York: Praeger Publishers. (V.1.d)

Glazer, Nathan
1974 Strategies for Intergration: II, On "Opening Up" the Suburbs. Public Interest 37(Fall):89-111. (III.4; V.1.d)

Goldberg, Miriam L., A. Harry Passow, and Joseph Justman
1966 The Effects of Ability Grouping. New York: Teachers College Press. (V.5.a)

Goodman, Mary
1964 Racial Awareness in Young Children. New York: Collier Books. (VI.2.b; VI.3.a; VI.3.b)

Goodman, Thomas L.
1968 The Need for School Lobbyists. Phi Delta Kappan 49(6):340-341. (V.4.a)

Gordon, Edmund W., and Doxey A. Wilkerson
1966 Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged. New York: College Entrance Examination Board. (IV.3.a; V.5.c)

Gottlieb, David, and Warren D. TenHouten
1965 Racial Composition and the Social System of Three High Schools. Journal of Marriage and the Family 27:204-12. (VI.3.b; VI.3.c)

Green, James A., and Harold B. Gerard
1974 School Desegregation and Ethnic Attitudes. *In* Intergrating the Organization: A Social Psychological Analysis. H. L. Fromkin and J. J. Sherwood, Eds. New York: The Free Press. pp. 291-311. (VI.3.b)

Green, Robert L.
1973 Community Control and Desegregation. School Review 81(3):347-356. (V.5.a)

Green, Robert L., and T. F. Pettigrew
1976 Urban Desegregation and White Flight: A Response to Coleman. Phi Delta Kappan (Feb):399-402. (IV.1; V.2.c)

Green, Robert L., Eugenia Smith, and John H. Schweitzer
1972 Busing and the Multiracial Classroom. Phi Delta Kappan 53(9):543-546. (V.1.c)

Groff, Patrick J.
1962 Teacher Organizations and School Desegregation. School and Society 90(2218):441-442. (V.4.b)

Guthrie, James W., George B. Kleindorfer, Henry M. Levin, and Robert T. Stout
1971 Schools and Inequality. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. (III.4)

Guthrie, James W., and Paula H. Skene
1973 The Escalation of Pedagogical Politics. Phi Delta Kappan 54(6):386-389. (V.4.a)

Hall, John A., and H. V. Wiant
1973 Does School Desegregation Change Occupational Goals of Negro Males? Journal of Vocational Behavior 3(2): 175-179. (VI.2.a)

Haller, Elizabeth S.
1970 Minority History: What? Why? How? Harrisburg: Pennsylvania State Department of Public Instruction, Bureau of

General and Academic Education. (V.5.d)

Hamilton, Charles

1968 Race and Education: A Search for Legitimacy. Harvard Educational Review 38(4):669-684. (II.3)

Argues that the concept of educational improvement held by black parents has gone beyond the experts' focus on achievement in verbal and mathematical skills. Black people want community control, not integration. They are just as interested in Afro-American culture as verbal and arithmetic skills.

Hanushek, Eric A.

1972 Education and Race: An Analysis of the Educational Production Process. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath and Company. (VI.1.a; VI.1.b)

Harris, Marvin

1975 Culture, People, and Nature. Second Edition. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell and Company. (II.2; IV.3.a)

Harvard Educational Review

1969 Equal Educational Opportunity. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (IV.2)

Harvey, James C., and Charles H. Holmes

1972 Busing and School Desegregation. Phi Delta Kappan 53(9):540-542. (V.1.c)

Hendrick, Clyde, and Donna K. Rumenik

1973 Race Versus Belief about Race as Determinants of Attraction: Belief Prejudices and Two Kinds of Race Prejudice. Journal of Research in Personality 7(2):148-164. (VI.3.c)

Hendrick, Irving, G.

1968 The Development of a School Integration Plan in Riverside, California: A History and Perspective. Riverside, CA: University of California. (Report No. RSS-SMP-M7-14) (V.1)

Hermalin, Albert I., and Reynolds Farley

1973 The Potential for Residential Integration in Cities and Suburbs: Implications for the Busing Controversy. American Sociological Review 38(5):595-610. (V.1.c)

Herman, Barry

1970 Interracial Attitudes Among 175 Sixth Grade Students. Curriculum Leadership 9:30-35. (VI.3.b)

Hillson, Maurie, Francesco Cordasco, and Francis P. Purcell

1969 Education and the Urban Community. New York: American Book Company. (III.2.c)

Hope, John, III., Ed.

1975 Twenty Years After *Brown*: Equality of Educational Opportunity. A Report of the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, March 1975. Washington, DC: Commission on Civil Rights. (IV.i)

Howe, Harold, III. et al.

1970 Racism and American Education: A Dialogue and Agenda for Action. New York: Harper and Row. (II)

A conference convened of well-known scholars and educators to discuss plans for altering racism in American education. Participants included Harold Howe, Kenneth Clark, James Allen, Lisle Carter, Eric Erickson, Milton Galimison and others.

Humphrey, Hubert H., Ed.

1964 Integration vs. Segregation. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company. (II.1)

Included in this volume is "The Southern Manifesto," a statement presented to Congress in 1956 by a group of 101 senators and representatives from eleven southern states.

Hyman, Jacob D., and Wade J. Newhouse

1964 Desegregation of the Schools: the Present Legal Situation. Urban Education 1(1):46-73. (III.1.c)

Irvine, LaVerne, and Norman R. Brierley

1973 Problem Solving in Resolving Problems Relating to School Desegregation. College Student Journal 7(3):68-72. (V.5.e)

Irwin, Orvis C.

1948 Infant Speech: The Effect of Family Occupational Status and of Age on Use of Sound Types. Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders 13 (September):224-226. (IV.3.a)

Jencks, Christopher S., and M. Brown

1975 The Effects of Desegregation on Student Achievement: Some New Evidence from the Equality of Educational Opportunity Survey. Sociology of Education 48:126-140. (VI.1.a)

Jencks, Christopher S., et al.
1972 Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effects of Family and Schooling in America. New York: Basic Book, Inc. (II.2; III.1.d; III.4; IV.2; IV.3; VI.1.b)

Jensen, Arthur R.
1968 Social Class, Race and Genetics: Implications for Education. American Educational Research Journal 5:1-42. (IV.3.a)
1969 How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement? Harvard Educational Review 39(1):1-123. (III.4; IV.3; IV.3.b)
1973 The Differences are Real. Psychology Today 7(7):80-86. (IV.3.b)

Johnson, James A., Jr., Ed.
1973 On the Interface Between Low-Income, Urban Black Children and Their Teachers During the Early School Years: A Position Paper. Report. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. (IV.3.d)

Johnson, John L.
1969 Special Education and the Inner City: A Challenge for the Future or Another Means for Cooling the Mark Out? Journal of Spcial Education 3(3):241-251. (V.5.a)

Kaplan, Sidney J., and A. Lee Coleman
1963 The Strategy of Change: Contrasting Approaches to Teacher Integration. Social Science (October):218-221. (V.5.e)

Katz, Irwin
1967a The Socialization of Academic Motivation in Minority Group Children. *In* Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, Vol. 15. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, (VI.2.a; VI.2.c)
1967b Some Motivational Determinants of Racial Differences in Intellectual Achievement. International Journal of Psychology 2 (1):1-12. (IV.3.a)

Katz, Irwin, and L. Benjamin
1960 Effects of White Authoritarianism in Biracial Work Groups. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 61:448-456. (V.5; VI.3.c)

Keddie, Nell, Ed.
1973 Tinker Tailor ... The Myth of Cultural Deprivation. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, Ltd. (IV.3.a)

Keppel, Francis
1967 Educational Technology and the Educational Park. *In* Educational Parks. U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, Clearinghouse Publication No. 9 Washington, D C: U. S. Government Printing Office. (V.1.b)

Killian, Lewis M., and Charles M. Crigg
1965 Community Resistance to and Acceptance of Desegregation. Journal of Negro Education 34(3):268-277. (V.2.a)

Kimball, Solon T., and Charles Wagley
1974 Race and Culture in School and Community. Final Report. ERIC: ED091489. (VI.3; VI.3.c; VI.4)

King, Charles E., and Robert R. Mayer
1972 The Exercise of Community Leadership for School Desegregation. Urban Education 7(3):215-234. (V.4.a; VI.3.c)

Kirby, David J., and Robert L. Crain
1974 The Functions of Conflict: School Desegregation in 91 Cities. Social Science Quarterly 55(2):478-492. (V.2.a; V.4.a)

Kirby, David J., T. Robert Harris, and Robert L. Crain
1973 Political Strategies in Northern School Desegregation. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books. (V.2.a)

Kirp, David L.
1970 Community Control, Public Policy, and the Limits of the Law. Michigan Law Review 68: 1355-1388. (V.3)
1973 Judicial Policy-Making: Inequitable Public School Financing and the Serrano Case (1971). *In* Politics in America. A. Sindler, Ed. pp. 82-123. (III.1.d)

Kirp, David L., and Mark G. Yudof
1974 Educational Policy and the Law: Cases and Materials. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Co. (III.1.a; III.1.e; III.1.f; III.4)
A useful book which describes important cases affecting education and includes synopses and quotes of published

analyses of the impact of the law on educational policy.

Klopf, Gordon J., and Garda W. Bowman

1966 Teacher Education in a Social Context: A Study of the Preparation of School Personnel for Working with Disadvantaged Children and Youth. New York: Mental Health Materials Center, Inc., for Bank Street College of Education. (V.5.e)

Koslin, Sandra, B. Koslin, R. Parament, and H. Waxman

1972 Classroom Racial Balance and Students' Interracial Attitudes. Sociology of Education 45:386-407. (VI.3.b; VI.3.c)

Krovetz, Martin L.

1972 Desegregation or Integration: Which is Our Goal? Phi Delta Kappan 54(4):247-249. (II.2)

Krystall, Eric, M. A. Chesler, and A. E. White

1967 Voting Behavior and Attitudes Toward School Desegregation: A Study of Southern Negroes. Tuskeegie, AL: Department of Social Science Research, Tuskeegie Institute. (VI.2.a)

Labov. William

1970 The Logic of Nonstandard English. *In* Language and Poverty: Perspectives on a Theme. Frederick Williams, Ed. Chicago: Markham Publishing Company. pp. 153-189. (IV.3.a)

Lacey, C.

1966 Some Sociological Concomitants of Academic Streaming in a Grammar School. British Journal of Sociology (September):245-262. (V.5.a)

Lamanna, Richard A.

1965 The Negro Teacher and Desegregation: A Study of Strategic Decision Makers and their Vested Interests in Different Community Contexts. Sociological Inquiry 26-40. (V.4.b)

Law and Contemporary Problems

1975 The Courts, Social Science, and School Desegregation: Parts I and II 39(2). Durham, N C: Duke University, School of Law. (VI)

Brings together articles by a number of individuals who have contributed a great deal to the literature on school desegregation; the articles review legal, policy, and research issues prominent in the evolution of the conceptualizations of desegregation.

Leacock, Eleanor B.

1969 Teaching and Learning in City Schools: A Comparative Study. New York: Basic Books. (IV.3.a; VI.3; VI.4)

Leacock, Eleanor, Martin Deutsch, and Joshua A. Fishman

1959 The Bridgeview Study: A Preliminary Report. Journal of Social Issues 15(4):30-37. (V.2.c)

Leeson, Jim

1966 Private Schools Continue to Increase in the South. Southern Education Report 2(4):22-25. (V.2.b)

1967 Private Schools for Whites Face Some Hurdles. Southern Education Report 3(4):13-17. (V.2.b)

Lesser, G., G. Fifer, and D. Clark

1965 Mental Abilities of Children from Different Social-Class and Cultural Groups. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, Serial No. 102,30(4). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. (IV.3.a)

Levin, Betsy, and Philip Moise

1975 School Desegregation Litigation in the Seventies and the Use of Social Science Evidence: An Annotated Guide. Law and Contemporary Problems 39(1):50-135. (III.1.a; III.1.b; III.1.c; III.1.e; III.4)

Levin, Henry M.

1974 Effects of Expenditure Increases on Educational Resource Allocation and Effectiveness. *In* School Finance in Transition: The Courts and Educational Reform. John Pincus, Ed. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company. pp. 177-198. (III.1.d)

Levine, Daniel V.

1969 The Segregated Society: What Must Be Done. Phi Delta Kappan 50(5):264-269. (II.2)

1973 Integration in Metropolitan Schools: Issues and Prospects. Phi Delta Kappan 54(10):651-657. (V.1.d)

Levine, David V., and Kenneth R. Mares

1970 Problems and Perceptions in a Desegregated Urban High School: A Case Description and Its Implications. Kansas City, MO: Missouri University, Center for the Study of Metropolitan Problems in Education. (V.5.e)

Lewis, Ralph, and Nancy H. St. John
1974 Contribution of Cross-Racial Friendship to Minority Group Achievement in Desegregated Classrooms. Sociometry 37:79-91. (VI.3.b)

Light, Richard J., and Paul V. Smith
1969 Social Allocation Models of Intelligence: A Methodological Inquiry. Harvard Educational Review 39(3):484-510. (IV.3.b)

Long, Herman H.
1955 The Challenge of Desegregation to Southern Social Scientists and Educators. Social Problems 2(4):204-207. (III.4)

Lowe, Joseph M.
1973 Improving Interpersonal Relationships Among Senior High School Students in a Recently Desegregated School. Office of Education ERIC: ED082081. (V.5.e)

Mahan, Thomas W., and A. M. Mahan
1971 The Impact of Schools on Learning: Inner City Children in Suburban Schools. Journal of School Psychology 9(1)1-11. (VI.2.c)

Mathews, John
1975 Busing is Stopped at the City Line. *In* From *Brown* to *Bradley*: School Desegregation 1954-1974. R. Stephen Browning, Ed. Cincinnati: Jefferson Law Book Company. pp. 199-202. (V.1.c)

Mayer, Robert, et al.
1974 The Impact of School Desegregation in a Southern City. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company. (VI.1.a)

McAdams, John D.
1974 Strategies for Integration: I, Can Open Enrollment Work? The Public Interest 37(Fall):69-88. (V.1.a)

McDonald, Marjorie
1970 Not by the Color of Their Skin: The Impact of Racial Differences on the Child's Development. New York: International Universities Press, Inc. (VI.2.b)

McDowell, Sophia F.
1967 Prejudices and Other Interracial Attitudes of Negro Youth. Final Report. ERIC: ED019390. (VI.3.b)

McPartland, James
1968 The Segregated Student in Desegregated Schools: Sources of Influence on Negro Secondary Students. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University, Center for the Study of Social Organization of School. (VI.2.b; VI.3.b)

Meranto, Philip
1967 The Politics of Federal Aid to Education in 1965: A Study in Political Innovation. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press. (III.2.c)

Mercer, Jane R.
1974 A Policy Statement on Assessment Procedures and the Rights of Children. Harvard Educational Review 44(1):125-141. (IV.3.c)

Miller, Joyce D.
1975 Student Suspensions in Boston: Derailing Desegregation. Inequality in Education 20(July):16-24. (V.5.b)

Mills, Nicolaus, Ed.
1973 The Great School Bus Controversy. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University. (V.1.c)

Minnesota State Board of Education
1971 Guidelines Relating to Equality of Educational Opportunity and Desegregation, Intra-Cultural Quality Education. Integrated Education 9(6):51-53. (V.5) Contains motivation for desegregation (denial of equal educational opportunity and promoting of prejudice and racism) and definitions.

Mizell, Mo Hayes
1968 A Divisive Issue: Freedom of Choice. Southern Education Report 3(6):18-21. (V.1.a)

Mosteller, Frederick, and Daniel P. Moynihan Eds.
1972 On Equality of Educational Opportunity. New York: Random House. (II.2; IV.1; IV.2; IV.3)

Moynihan, Daniel P.
1969 Sources of Resistance to the Coleman Report. *In* Equal Educational Opportunity. James S. Coleman, et al., Eds. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. pp. 25-38. (III.4; IV.2; IV.3)

Mumford, Luther

1973 White Flight From Desegregation in Mississippi. Integrated Education 11(3):12-26. (V.2.c)

Myers, Miles

1966 The role of the AFT in School Desegregation. Changing Education 1(3):39-45. (V.4.b)

Myrdal, Gunnar

1944 An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy. New York: Harper and Brothers. (II.2)

Nash, Kermit

1968 Mental Health in the Desegregated School. Integrated Education 30:28-36. (VI.2.c)

NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund

1971 An Even Chance. Washington, D C: NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund. (III.2.c; III.3)

Evaluation of federally sponsored Indian education programs for compliance with authorization requirements.

NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund

1973 It's Not the Distance, "It's the Niggers." *In* The Great School Bus Controversy. Nicolaus Mills, Ed. New York: Teachers College Press. (II.1; V.1.c)

National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children

1967 Title I-ESEA: A Review and a Forward Look. Washington, D C: U. S. Government Printing Office. (III.2.c)

Compliance evaluation of programs supported by grants-in-aid authorized by Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

National Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities of the National Education Association

1965 Report on Task Force Survey of Teacher Displacement in Seventeen States. Washington, D C: U.S. Government Printing Office. (V.4.b)

National School Public Relations Association

1970 Black Studies in Schools. Education U.S.A. Special Report. Washington, D C: National School Public Relations Association. (V.5.d)

New York City Board of Education

1968 Teaching About Minorities in Classroom Situations: Resource Bulletin for Teachers in the Secondary Schools. Curriculum Bulletin, 1967-68 Series, No. 23. Brooklyn: New York City Board of Education, Bureau of Curriculum Development. (V.5.d)

Nicholas, Lynn N., S. Virgo, and William W. Wattenberg

1965 Effects of Socio-economic Settings and Organizational Climate on Problems Brought to Elementary School Offices. Final Report of Cooperative Research Project N2394. Detroit: Wayne State University, College of Education. (VI.4)

Noar, Gertrude

1966 The Teacher and Integration. Washington, D C: National Education Association. (V.5.e)

Ogbu, John

n.d. Manuscript on cross-cultural analysis of minority education. To be published by Academic Press, New York. (II.4)

Oklahoma State Department of Education

1971 A Curriculum Guide for Human Relations Education in Oklahoma Schools. Oklahoma City: Oklahoma Curriculum Improvement Commission. (V.5.e)

O'Reilly, Robert P.

1970 Social Class and Ethnic Status: Relationship to Intellectual and Educational Development and Related Factors. *In* Racial and Social Class Isolation in the Schools: Implications for Educational Policy and Programs. Robert P. O'Reilly, Ed. New York: Praeger Publishers. pp. 94-137. (VI.2.c)

Orfield, Gary

1969a The Politics of Resegregation. Saturday Review (September 20): 58-60, 77-79. (III.1.b; III.2.b; V.1)

1969b The Reconstruction of Southern Education: The Schools and the 1964 Civil Rights Act. New York: Wiley-Interscience. (II.1; III.1.a; III.1.b; III.1.f; III.2.a; III.2.b; V.1.a; V.2.a)

A detailed, careful account of the actors, groups, and events of importance leading up to the passage and enforcement of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

1975 Congress, the President, and Anti-Busing Legislation, 1966-1974. *In* From

Brown to *Bradley*: School Desegregation 1954-1974. R. Stephen Browning, Ed. Cincinnati: Jefferson Law Book Company. (II.1; III.1.b; III.2.a; III.2.b; III.2.c; V.1.c)

Describes the role of Congress in desegregation during the Johnson and Nixon administrations. Primary focus is given to the antibusing legislation proposals.

1976 Response to Is Coleman Right. Richard Farley. Social Policy 6(4):24-29. (V.2.c)

Ornstein, Allan C.

1974 Race and Politics in School/Community Organizations. Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear Publishing Company. (V.1; V.1.d)

Osser, Harry

1973 Biological and Social Factors in Language Development. *In* Advances in Communication Research. C. David Mortensen and Kenneth K. Sereno, Eds. New York: Harper and Row. pp. 376-387. (IV.3.a)

Ozmon, Howard A.

1965 The Right of the Negro Teachers. American School Board Journal 13-14. (V.4.b)

Palmer, James M.

1971 Resegregation and the Private School Movement. Integrated Education 9(3):5-10. (V.2.b)

Payne, James S., Cecil D. Mercer, Ruth A. Payne, and Roxana G. Davison

1973 Head Start: A Tragicomedy with Epilogue. New York: Behavioral Publications. (V.5.c)

Peltason, Jack

1961 Fifty-Eight Lonely Men. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World. (III.1.a; III.1.b)

Peterson, John H., Jr.

1975 Black-White Joking Relationships Among Newly-Integrated Faculty. Integrated Education 13(1):33-37. (V.5.e)

Pettigrew, Thomas F.

1964 Negro American Intelligence: A New Look at an Old Controversy. Journal of Negro Education 33(1):6-25. (IV.3.b)

1969a The Negro and Education: Problems and Proposals. *In* Race and the Social Sciences. Irwin Katz and Patricia Gurin, Eds. New York: Basic Books, Inc. (VI.2.b)

1969b Race and Equal Educational Opportunity. *In* Equal Educational Opportunity. Harvard Educational Review, Eds. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. pp. 69-79. (II.2; VI; VI.3)

1972 Public Policy and Desegregation Research. Integrated Education 10(1):18-22. (III.4)

1975 The Cold Structural Inducements to Integration. Urban Review 8:137-144. (V.4.b; VI.4)

Pettigrew, Thomas F., Elizabeth L. Useem, Clarence Normand, and Marchall S. Smith

1973 Busing: A Review of "The Evidence." Public Interest 30 (Winter):88-118. (V.1.c; VI.1.a)

Pettigrew, Thomas F. and M. Richard Cramer

1959 The Demography of Desegregation. Journal of Social Issues 15 (4):61-71. (V.2.c)

Pincus, John, Ed.

1974 School Finance in Transition: The Courts and Educational Reform. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company. (III.1.d)

Porter, Judith D. R.

1971 Black Child, White Child: The Development of Racial Attitudes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (VI.3.a; VI.3.b)

Pringle, M. L. Kellmer, and Margaret Tanner

1958 The Effects of Early Deprivation on Speech Development: A Comparative Study of Four Year Olds in a Nursery School and in Residential Nurseries. Language and Speech 1(October-December):269-287. (IV.3.a)

Proshansky, Harold, and Peggy Newton

1968 The Nature and Meaning of Negro Self-Identify. *In* Social Class, Race, and Psychological Development. Deutsch, Katz, and Jensen, Eds. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. pp. 178-218. (VI.2.b; VI.3.a)

Read, Frank T.

1975 Judicial Evolution of the Law of School Integration Since *Brown* v. *Board of Education*. Law and Contemporary Problems 39 (1):7-50. (III.1.a; III.1.b; III.1.c)

Redisch, Ann, and Theodore A. Weissbach

1974 Traits Attributions by White Students to Black Fellow Students Versus Blacks in General, Journal of Social Psychology 92(1): 147-148. (VI.2.b)

Riccio, Anthony C., and K. D. Barnes

1973 Counselor Preferences of Senior High School Students. Counselor Education and Supervision 13(1):36-40. (VI.3.b)

Riessman, Frank

1962 The Culturally Deprived Child. New York: Harper and Row. (IV.3.a)

Rist, Ray C.

1973 The Urban School: A Factory for Failure. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. (III.4: V.5.a; VI.3; VI.4)

1974a Busing White Children into Black Schools: A Study in Controversy. Integrated Education 12(4):13-18. (V.1.c)

1974b Race, Policy, and Schooling. Society 12(1):59-63. (II.4)

1976 School Integration and Minority Student Tokenism. Integrated Education 14(1):18-20. (VI.2)

n.d. Bibliography from manuscript of his forthcoming book on desegregation in a west coast city. (I.2)

Rist, Ray C., and Gary Orfield

1976 School Desegregation and White Flight, Introduction. Social Policy 6(4):6-8. (IV.1; V.2.c)

Rivlin, Alice M.

1973 Forensic Social Science. *In* Perspectives on Inequality. Harvard Educational Review 43(1):25-40. (III.4)

Rodgers, Frederick A., et al.

1973 Identification of Problems and Concerns Regarding Educational Research and Development Activities Involving Black Citizens. A Final Report. ERIC: ED091360.

Report on a Conference of black educators, professionals, and citizens held by the National Institute of Education for the purpose of gaining input for NIE's research and development efforts. Great emphasis was given by the conferees to greater control over policy formation. research objectives and methodologies, and governance of the schools.

Rodgers, Harrell R., Jr., and Charles S. Bullock

1972 School Desegregation: A Policy Analysis. Journal of Black Studies 2(4):409-437. (III.3)

Rogers, David

1967 Obstacles to School Desegregation in New York City: A Benchmark Case. *In* Educating an Urban Population. Marilyn Gittell, Ed. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. pp. 155-184. (V.2.a)

Rogers takes a close look at New York City desegregation, defining roles of some of the important participants involved, including ethnic groups, parents, school board and certain school-related political organizations.

Roper, Susan Stavert

1971 The Effect of Race on Assertive Behavior and Responses to Assertive Behavior in Small Groups. EDIC: ED051317. (VI.3.c)

Rose, Arnold

1964 De Facto School Segregation. New York: National Conference of Christians and Jews. (IV.1)

Rosen, Bernard C.

1956 The Achievement Syndrome: A Psychocultural Dimension on Social Stratification. American Sociological Review 21(April): 203-211. (IV.3.a)

1959 Race Ethnicity and the Achievement Syndrome. American Sociological Review 24:47-60 (VI.2.a)

Rosenberg, Morris, and Roberta G. Simons

1972 Black and White Self-Esteem: The Urban School Child. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association. (VI.2.b)

Rosenfeld, Gerry

1971 "Shut Those Thick Lips!" A Study of Slum School Failure. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. (III.4; VI.3.d)

Rosenthal, Robert, and Lenore F. Jacobson

1968 Pygmalion in the Classroom. New

York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. (IV.3.c)

Sachdeva, Darshan

1973 A Measurement of Changes in Interracial Student Attitudes in Desegregated Schools. Journal of Educational Research 66(9):418-422. (VI.3.b)

St. John, Nancy H.

1971 Thirty-Six Teachers: Their Characteristics and Outcomes for Black and White Pupils. American Educational Research Journal 8(4):635-647. (VI.1.a)

1975 School Desegregation, Outcomes for Children. New York: John Wiley and Sons. (VI; VI.2.b; VI.2.c; VI.3; VI.3.a; VI.3.c)

Reviews over 120 published and unpublished articles describing research studies designed to investigate the consequences for children of school desegregation; she stresses the multifaceted nature of a social phenomenon such as desegregation which can, under differing conditions, have both positive and negative results; especially good for its appendices of charts which organize the research reviewed by problem studied, sample used, and findings.

St. John, Nancy H., and Ralph G. Lewis

1971 The Influence of School Racial Context on Academic Achievement. Social Problems 19:68-78. (VI.1.a)

1975 Race and the Social Structure of the Elementary Classroom. Sociology of Education 48:346-368. (VI.3.c)

Saint Louis Board of Education

1969 A Plan to Increase Vocational Education Opportunities Through the Expansion of Curriculum and Available Facilities. Final Report. ERIC: ED042881. (V.1.a)

Sartain, J. A.

1966 Attitudes of Parents and Children Towards Desegregation. Doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1967. No. 67-2836. (VI.3.b)

Schwartz, Robert, Thomas Pettigrew, and Marshall Smith

1968 Desegregation: Assessing the Alternatives. Nation's Schools 81(3): 61-66. (II.2; II.3)

Short policy-oriented discussion of alternatives to desegregation such as compensatory education and community control.

Scott, David W.

1972 School District Integration in a Metropolitan Area. Education and Urban Society 4(2):135-154. (V.1.d)

Seward, G.

1956 Psychotherapy and Culture Conflict. New York: Ronald Press. (VI.2.b)

Shaw, Marvin E.

1974 The Self-Image of Black and White Pupils in an Integrated School. Journal of Personality 42(1):12-22. (VI.2.b)

Shaycoft, Marion F.

1967 The High School Years: Growth in Cognitive Skills. Pittsburgh: American Institute for Research and School of Education, University of Pittsburgh. (VI.1.a)

Shuey, Audrey

1966 The Testing of Negro Intelligence. New York: Social Science Press. (IV.3.b)

Silberman, Charles E.

1962 The City and the Negro. Fortune 65(March):89-92.

Silverman, Irwin, and Marvin E. Shaw

1973 Effects of Sudden Mass School Desegregation on Interracial Interaction and Attitudes in one Southern City. Journal of Social Issues 29(4):133-142. (VI.3.c)

Silverthorne, Colin, et al.

1974 The Effect of Competition and Cooperation on Level of Prejudice. Journal of Social Psychology 92:293-301. (VI.3.c)

Sizemore, Barbara

1972 Is There a Case for Separate Schools? Phi Delta Kappan 53(5): 281-284. (II.2; II.3; II.4)

Following Handlin, adopts definitions of integration and desegregation useful to understanding shift to Black Power orientation. Desegregation (racial balance) like segregation is seen as an imposition in which the superior/subordinate relationship is maintained. Sizemore incorporates into her essay notions of radical approaches to education such as Freire.

Smith, Marshall S., and J. S. Bissel

1970 Report Analysis: The Impact of Head Start. Harvard Educational Review 40:51-104. (V.5.c)

Smith, Paul M.

1971 The Role of the Guidance Counselor in the Desegregation Process. Journal of Negro Education 40(4):347-351. (V.5.e)

Smith, Ralph V., Stanley E. Flory, R. L. Bashshur, and G. W. Shannon

1967 Community Interaction and Racial Integration in the Detroit Area: an Ecological Analysis. Ypsilanti: Eastern Michigan University. (VI.2.a)

Sobel, Morton J.

1973 What's Really Blocking School Desegregation? Equal Opportunity Review (July):1-4. (V.4.b)

Somerville, Addison, W.

1969 The Neighborhood School Concept: Its Rationale and Practical Values. *In* Integration and Education. David W. Beggs and S. Kern Alexander, Eds. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company. pp. 121-142. (V.3)

Southern Regional Council

1969 The Federal Retreat in School Desegregation. Atlanta: Southern Regional Council. (III.3)

Southern Regional Council, and Robert F. Kennedy Memorial

1973 The Student Pushout: Victim of Continued Resistance to Desegregation. Atlanta: Southern Regional Council. (V.5.b)

Spady, W.

1973 The Impact of School Resources of Students. *In* Review of Research in Education. F. N. Kerlinger, Ed. Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock. pp. 135-177. (V.4.b)

Spratlen, Thaddeus H.

1973 Financing Inner City Schools: Policy Aspects of Economics, Political and Racial Disparity. Journal of Negro Education 42(3):283-307. (III.1.d)

Stanley, Julian C., Ed.

1973 Compensatory Education for Children Ages Two to Eight: Recent Studies of Educational Intervention. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press. (V.5.c)

Stent, Madelon D., W. P. Hazard, and H. N. Rivlin

1973 Cultural Pluralism in Education: A Mandate for Change. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts. (V.5)

The book contains a set of papers given at a national conference on education and teacher education for cultural pluralism held in 1971. The conference was sponsored by a teacher training program funded by the Office of Education at the insistence of minority members of the program. The book also contains conference resolutions for action by OE based on the cultural pluralism approach.

Stout, Robert T., and Gerald E. Sroufe

1968 Politics Without Power, the Dilemma of a Local School System. Phi Delta Kappan 49(6):342-345. (V; V.4.a)

Suchman, Edward A., John P. Dean, and Robert M. Williams

1958 Desegregation: Some Propositions and Research Suggestions. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. (V.1)

Sullivan, Neil V.

1968 Myths and Gaps in School Integration. Today's Education 57(6):38-42. (II.1)

Supreme Court

1955 Text of the Supreme Court Opinions May 17, 1954. Social Problems 2(4):221-235. (IV.1.a)

Swanson, Bert E.

1965 School Integration Controversies in New York City, a Pilot Study. Bronxville, NY: Sarah Lawrence College, Institute for Community Studies. (V.1.b)

This report explores the problems and decision-making processes associated with introduction of desegregation in New York City, where the Princeton Plan of pairing was used.

Talbert, Carol

1970 Interaction and Adaptation in Two Negro Kindergartens. Human Organization 29(2):103-114. (VI.4)

Taylor, William

1973 The Legal Battle for Metropolitanism. School Review 81(3):331-345. (III.1.c)

Terjon, Kitty

1971 The Segregation Academy Movement. *In* The South and Her Children: School Desegregation 1970-1971. Southern Regional Council, Ed. Atlanta: Southern Regional Council. (V.2.b)

Thorndike Robert L.

1968 Review of Pygmalion in the Classroom. American Educational Research Journal 5(4):708-711. (IV.3.c)

University of Florida Libraries

1960 Segregation and Desegregation in American Education. Third Edition. Gainesville, FL: Education Library, College of Education, University of Florida. (I.2)

1962 Segregation and Desegregation in American Education. Fourth Edition. No. 62, May, 1962. Gainesville, FL: Education Library, College of Education, University of Florida. (I.2)

U. S. Commission on Civil Rights

1961 Third Annual Conference on Problems of Schools in Transition from the Educator's Viewpoint. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office. (V.1)

1967a Education Parks, Appraisals of Plans to Improve Educational Quality and Desegregate the Schools. U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, Clearing-House Publication No. 9. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. (V.1)

1967b Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, Volumes 1, and 2. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. (IV.1; V.1.b; VI.1.a)

1975 The Federal Civil Rights Enforcement Effort—1974. Volume 3: To Ensure Equal Educational Opportunity. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office. (III.1.f; III.2.b)

The fifth evaluation of the Federal Government's effort to end discrimination undertaken by the Commission covers the period between July 1972 and June 1974. The activities and responsibilities of a number of Federal agencies with civil rights enforcement responsibilities related to education are reviewed in this volume, including HEW's Office for Civil Rights; the Internal Revenue Service; and Veterans Administration.

Valentine, Charles A.

1971 Deficit, Difference and Bicultural Models of Afro-American Behavior. Harvard Educational Review 41(2): 137-158. (II.4; IV.3.d)

1972 Models and Muddles Concerning Culture and Inequality. Harvard Educational Review 42(1):97-108. (IV.3.d)

A reply to some of the critics of Valentine's previous work on the relationship between culture and poverty and the nature of difficulties black people encounter in "mainstream" institutions. Valentine emphasizes the importance of structural inequalities.

Van Den Haag, Ernest

1960 Social Science Testimony in the Desegregation Cases—A Reply to Professor Kenneth Clark Villanova Law Review 6:69-79. (III.4)

Vander Zanden, James W.

1958 Turbulence Accompanying School Desegregation. Journal of Educational Sociology 32(2):68-75. (V.2.a; V.4.a)

Veroff, Joseph, and Stanton Peele

1969 Initial Effects of Desegregation on the Achievement Motivation of Negro Elementary School Children. Journal of Social Issues 25(3):71-91. (VI.2.a)

Vontress, Clemmont E.

1969 Cultural Differences: Implications for Counseling. Journal of Negro Education 38(3):266-275. (V.5.e)

Walker, Dollie, et al.

1967 School Desegregation in Baltimore. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University. (IV.1)

Watson, Bernard C.

1975 School Integration: Its Meaning, Costs and Future. *In* From *Brown* to *Bradley*, School Desegregation 1954-1974. R. Stephen Browning, Ed. Cincinnati: Jefferson Law Book Company. pp. 15-17. (VI.1.b)

Weber, George, and Arthur Pearl

1966 Two Views Concerning Ability Grouping. Southern Education Report 2(5):2-8. (V.5.a)

Webster, S. W., and M. N. Kroger

1966 A Comparative Study of Selected Perceptions and Feelings of Negro Adolescents With and Without White Friends in Integrated Urban High Schools. Journal of Negro Education 35:55-61. (VI.3.c)

Weinberg, Meyer

1968 Desegregation Research: An Appraisal. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa. (VI)

Reviews and assesses experimental studies, most unpublished, of the many hypotheses related to school desegregation.

Weinberg, Meyer, Ed.

1967 School Integration: A Comprehensive Classified Bibliography of 3,100 References. Chicago: Integrated Education Association. (I.2)

1970 The Education of the Minority Child: A Comprehensive Bibliography of 10,000 Selected Entries. Chicago: Integrated Education Association. (I.2)

Weinstein, Eugene A., and Paul N. Geisel

1962 Family Decision Making Over Desegregation. Sociometry 25(1):21-29. (V.1.a)

Westphal, Mary C.

1970 Reaction: Minority Sensitivity Training. Public Personnel Review 31(2):74-77. (V.5.e)

Wey, Herbert, and John Corey

1959 Action Patterns in School Desegregation, a Guidebook. Bloomington, In Phi Delta Kappa. (V.1; VI.4)

White, R. D.

1974 School Finance Reform: Courts and Legislatures. Social Science Quarterly 55:331-346. (II.2)

Examines the Rodriguez case in the context of the interaction between the judicial and legislative elements.

White, Sheldon H., M. C. Day, R. K. Freeman, S. A. Hartman, and K. P. Messenger

1973 Federal Programs for Young Children: Review and Recommendations. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office. (V.5.c)

White William F.

1969 Psychological Principles Applied to Class Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company. (IV.3.c)

Wholey, Joseph S., John W. Scanlon, Hugh G. Duffy, James S. Fukumoto, and Leona M. Vogt

1970 Federal Evaluation Policy: Analyzing the Effects of Public Programs. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute. (III.4)

Williams, John E.

1966 Connotations of Racial Concepts and Color Names. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology: 331-340. (VI.2.b)

Williams, John E., Deborah L. Best, Frank B. Wood, and John W. Filler

1973 Changes in the Connotations of Racial Concepts and Color Names: 1963-1970. Psychological Reports 33(3):983-996. (VI.2.b)

Williams, Robert L., and F. Venditti

1969 Effect of Academic Integration of Southern Negro Students' Expressed Satisfaction with School. Journal of Social Psychology 79(2):203-209. (VI.2.a)

Willie, Charles V.

1964 Anti-Social Behavior Among Disadvantaged Youth: Some Observations on Prevention for Teachers. Journal of Negro Education 33(1):176-181. (V.5.e)

Willover, Donald J., Terry L. Eidell, and Wayne K. Hoy

1973 Penn State Studies. No. 24. The School and Pupil Control Ideology. University Park: Pennsylvania State University. (V.5; VI.4)

Winschel, J. F.

1970 In the Dark . . . Reflections on Compensatory Education, 1960-1970. *In* Disadvantaged Child, Volume 3: Compensatory Education: A National Debate. J. Hellmuth, Ed. New York: Brunner/Mazel. pp. 3-23. (V.5.c)

Wisdom. John Minor

1975 Random Remarks on the Role of Social Sciences in the Judicial Decision-Making Process in School Desegregation Cases. Law and Contemporary Problems 39(1);134-150. (III.4)

Wolf, Eleanor P., and Leo Wolf
1962 Sociological Perspective on the Education of Culturally Deprived Children. The School Review 70(4):373-387. (IV.3.a)

Yarrow, Marion R., J. D. Campbell, and L. J. Yarrow
1958 Acquisition of New Norms: A Study of Racial Desegregation. Journal of Sociological Issues 14(8):8-28. (VI.2.b; VI.3)

Yudof, Mark G.
1975 Suspension and Expulsion of Black Students from the Public Schools: Academic Capital Punishment and the Constitution. Law and Contemporary Problems 39(2):374-411. (V.5.b)

THE PROCESS OF INTERRACIAL SCHOOLING: AN ASSESSMENT OF CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS AND METHODOLOGICAL ORIENTATIONS

Thomas W. Collins
George W. Noblit

Memphis State University
Memphis, Tennessee

INTRODUCTION

The process of interracial education has been and continues to be a subject of much controversy, and underlines the political nature of the history of public education in this country. The scientific research, reasoned debate and emotional diatribes render judgments of the process that are highly diverse in substance not only between the modes of expression, but also within them. This creates some difficulty in any attempt to review and synthesize the literature. All too often such attempts, while cognizant of this, do not attempt to systematically account for these diversities. This literature attempts to incorporate an analysis and possible explanation(s) of the diversity through an investigation of the relationship of research methodology and conceptual framework employed in the analysis of the process of interracial education. Thus, it will be possible to gain some understanding of how methodology and explanation interact. This would seem to be significant to all those who are to fund research, conduct research and/or read research findings. If there seems to be more or less systematic patterns emerging from this endeavor, then all three audiences may be able to better organize their thoughts relative to school interracial processes as well as understand some of the limitations that may impinge upon the existent literature and the findings represented, and research that is needed.

ORGANIZATION OF THE LITERATURE REVIEW

The review of literature is organized into nine "issue" areas that were inductively derived. They are:

1. Law and Politics
2. Community Concerns
3. School Administration
4. Order and Discipline
5. Curriculum and Instruction
6. Faculty
7. Co-Curricular Activities
8. Extraschool Factors
9. Consequences for Students

Each of these areas will be discussed separately with the exception of co-curricular activities for which there was little literature available. Co-curricular activities will be discussed as part of the concluding remarks.

It is undeniable that these categories do not encompass all of the issues that exist or have been suggested. However, the attempt was to organize the mass of literature into the most parsimonious scheme possible without grossly misrepresenting, hopefully, both the themes in the literatures and the authors' intentions. It should be noted that this review is not an exhaustive one.* The vast amount of literature precluded any such attempt. Meyer Weinberg (1970), however, has organized an exhaustive bibliography worthy of perusal by those concerned with interracial education.

---

*The bibliography includes all references cited in text plus some additional references that are important to discussion herein, but were not cited in the text.

Within each issue area we have attempted to abstract the predominant themes and/or concerns. It should be emphasized that only what seemed to be the major themes will be reviewed. Minor or underlying themes could not even be outlined in a review of limited length. Further, it is evident that the concerns with the process of interracial education are not easily broken down into discrete themes. Many authors are trying to represent it holistically, and with some success. Nevertheless, the themes and the concerns do seem to be discrete enough to allow this review. This, of course, may violate some of the intentions of the authors at the time of their writing or their present thinking. It is hoped that this is rare, and that the authors will be tolerant with the attempt to achieve the goals of this review.

To explore the hypothesis that research methodology and conceptual framework are related, it was first necessary to create decision rules about what constitutes what type of research methodology. It appears that three methodologies exist: commentary, quantitative research and qualitative research. Yet, distinctions even between these three were often difficult. The line between commentary and some expressions of qualitative research is sometimes fuzzy; as is the line between quantitative and qualitative research that use observational techniques that count behaviors. The decisions in both situations are based on how the material was treated by the authors. If the author seemed to view the study as qualitative, it was treated as such.

The conceptual frameworks are as inductively derived from each issue area of the literature. Some issue areas have more variety in conceptual frameworks than others. The conclusion will attempt to examine the implications of this pattern.

LAW AND POLITICS

There are many excellent summary reviews of the Federal Court decisions covering the years since *Brown* v. *Board of Education* (Jones 1974; Kirp 1968; C. V. Smith 1975). Perhaps the best analysis is put forth by Read (1975:10) where he divides the past two decades into four historical periods. They are as follows:

> The first period covers the time frame between *Brown II* in 1955 and the James Meridith affair in 1963. It is characterized by a series of pitched judicial battles over token desegregation. The second period, covering the years between 1963 and 1967, is typified by the struggles of the lower federal courts, without the Supreme Court guidance, to evolve desegregation standards and to break down entrenched local resistance. The third period, from 1968 through 1972, is the period of judicial revolution in the Deep South; federal courts, stung by Supreme Court impatience, issued decrees mandating massive integration. The fourth period, from the Supreme Court's holding in *Swann* v. *Charlotte-Meckleburg Board of Education* in 1971 to date, is characterized by confusion over the future of integration, attempts to move integration activity from the South to the ghettos and barrios of the East and West, and litigation over a host of second-generation integration problems.

During the second period (1963-67), pushed by the Civil Rights movement, Congress passed the first meaningful legislation in the cause of equal education and reform; the Civil Rights Act of 1964. In particular, Title VI enabled a social revolution to begin by holding that discriminatory school programs could no longer be supported with federal dollars. The full power of this Act was not apparent until the following year when the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was passed by Congress making larger amounts of federal funding available to Southern school districts. Batten (1970) states Title VI shifted the burden of dismantling the dual school system of the South from the federal judiciary to the federal bureaucracy. The Office of Education in HEW sent their representatives out to districts to review compliance with the HEW Guidelines and recommended federal fund cut-offs where necessary. Thus, local civil rights groups were able to receive an immediate review of their complaints on discrimination rather than proceed through the long and expensive court litigation of earlier years.

Ultimately the power of Title VI was focused on the districts which formerly maintained dual (de jure) systems (Craven 1970; Orfield 1969).

Massive desegregation became a fact of life for all Southern districts during the period between 1968-72. The Supreme Court was impatient when it handed down its decision on *Green* v. *County School Board* in May, 1968 (roughly one month after Dr. Martin Luther King's assassination and the subsequent widescale rioting in many urban centers). *Green* ended "freedom-of-choice" plans as a method of desegregation. This method had only produced token attendance of blacks in formally all-white schools. Emphasis was now placed on percentages of racial-mixing in Southern schools and plans had to be implemented immediately. Thus, the public school districts of the South capitualted to the courts and integrated their system.

From 1972 to the present, the major concern has been placed on student assignments for racial mixing. In 1971, in *Swann* v. *Charlotte-Mecklenburg*, the Supreme Court authorized altering of attendance zones. For the first time, busing became an "accepted tool of education polity." Local district plans could no longer be limited to walk-in schools. There were other means (e.g. pairing and grouping of attendance zones) but as Foster (1973) points out, most of them had failed. Busing was the new remedy for the cities; North and South.

Perhaps the most controversial option of all desegregation plans is busing. The literature on busing is extensive. There are excellent case studies and analyses of particular aspects of busing experiences written on Greenville and Greensburo (Bagwell 1972), Memphis (Egerton 1973), Centerline (LaPorte, Becker, Willie 1965), Louisville (Perly 1975), Pontiac (Efthim 1971), Inglewood (Bonacich and Goodman 1972), Charlottesville, Providence and Sacramento (Holden 1974). Cottle (1975) details the legal ploys used to prevent racial-mixing in Boston. The politics of desegregation at the community level comparing eight Northern cities and seven Southern cities is provided by Crain (1968). The various political maneuvering, the factionalism and policy adjustments are detailed in most of the studies.

Social scientists have also contributed a number of studies on the impact of busing on the student. Perhaps David Armor's (1972) work is the most widely cited in the literature. He attempted to assess the effects of busing on academic achievement, aspirations, self-concept, race-relations and educational opportunities in five different cities from Riverside, California to White Plains, New York. He concludes that mandatory busing for purposes of improving student achievement and interracial harmony is not effective and should not be adopted. Although this policy recommendation warmed the hearts of the anti-integration forces, it was rejected out of hand by the pro-integration forces. Thomas Pettigrew et al (1973) produced an extensive criticism of Armor's work. In their rebuttal, Pettigrew et al. assailed Armor's standards for judgment (i.e., busing is successful if it leads to increased achievement in one year) and its methodological weaknesses. Also, they assert that the study simply ignored busing programs which have been reported as successful.

Weinberg (1975) carried out a comprehensive review of the relationship of desegregation and academic achievement. He concludes there can be gains in achievement of racial minorities if the following characteristics are present during desegregation:

1. a relative absence of interracial hostility among students,
2. teachers and administrators who understand and accept minority students, encouraged and reinforced by aggressive in-service training programs,
3. the majority of students in a given classroom are from middle and/or upper socioeconomic classes,
4. desegregation at the classroom as well as at the school level, praticularly in elementary schools,
5. no rigid ability grouping or tracking, particularly in elementary schools,
6. an absence of racial conflict in the community over desegregation, and
7. younger children are involved (though this last conclusion should be considered very tentative).

Summary

There remains a great deal of confusion as to how the courts have arrived at the decisions in desegregation cases. Taylor et al. (1976) summarizes the legal principles that govern courts. In spite of the insistence of masses of sociological and educational studies since *Brown*, they conclude most court orders are based on constitutional considerations and such matters as the stability of desegregation plans rather than sociological theory.

The legal and political literature is essentially commentary and qualitative, and there is little variation in conceptual framework by mode of expression. Yet some quantitative and qualitative research is called for that complies what the judges consider credible evidence and viable remedies. Thus, the legal/political process of school desegregation may become more lucid.

COMMUNITY CONCERNS

Coleman (1976) and Coleman et al. (1975) raises the issue of school segregation by districts resulting from desegregation within districts. Compiling data from both large and small districts across the U.S., he concludes school desegregation is a casual factor in white flight. However, other research does not support this position. Everett Cataldo et al. (1975) in their Florida study found the rejection rate (children leaving a newly desegregated school) to be less than four percent. In another well-researched study in Baltimore, Stinchcombe et al. (1969) determined that once a school is desegregated the proportion of blacks will rise each year at a steady rate of seven percent per year. The critical change, or what they refer to as the "tipping point," is linked to supply and demand of housing rather than racial balance in the schools. Whites simply have more alternatives than do blacks which intensifies the need for black housing. Once a neighborhood is open to blacks they tend to fill up all available housing. Rossell (1975a; 1975b) makes a similar conclusion about linkage of flight to housing needs. Orfield (1975), in addition to housing, lists several more factors influencing the rate of racial transition of the cities (e.g., urban riots, increasing crime and violence, rising city taxation rates, decline in central city services). But as Rossell adds, "it is not enough to say white flight is not increased by school desegregation. We need to know how to stop flight altogether" (1975a: 689).

The black community and some of its leadership appear to be having second thoughts about desegregation. Blacks find their children burdened with abnormally high suspension rates relative to that of whites (Bell 1972) rigid tracking systems, and quite often, tokenism rather than a reasonable racial ratio or "critical mass" (Pettigrew 1975; Rist 1974, 1976). Black spokesmen such as Charles Hamilton (1968) and Shirley Chisholm (1975) see busing and other desegregation plans as a reduction in resources and control of minorities communities. It is difficult for parents to participate (e.g., PTA meetings) in their child's education when he or she is bused out of the neighborhood. Moreover, it is impossible for black parents to make alliance with black teachers to promote better schools. As Hamilton (quoted in Ravitch 1976) testified against busing before a Congressional Committee, "blacks need more economic and political self-sufficiency more than they need racially balanced schools."

Perhaps the best recent community study to be produced by an anthropologist emphasizing formal education involvement is Ogbu's (1974) work in Stockton, California. It is a multiethnic situation where each group must negotiate with the power of the school. He sees community historical factors influencing education in terms of performance of children in school. In a sense it is an adaptation to the realities of the economic conditions of the community (i.e., life chances in an unstable job market). Thus, Ogbu argues, there is a loss of desire to perform or compete effectively in school work. The school system contributes to this stiuation by defining problems in psychological and clinical terms. He concludes, by saying the schools have not changed their treatment of subordinate minorities; the basic orientations are still determined by the ideas and policies of the dominant group.

There is a trend in the literature to question the continuing benefits of desegregation for black children. Ravitch (1976) presents one of the best commentaries on the changing attitudes among black schools. In districts such as Atlanta where the blacks now control city government and the school administration, there is no interest in diluting its base of political power by busing children out to suburban districts. Decentralization of large districts is encouraged by Solomon (1970) to increase the local control by black parents. And Glasser (1969) states it is workable. The chaos created in the experiment in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville area of New York was not caused by local community control but resulted from efforts to undermine community control. Indeed this experiment demonstrates the potential of the black community to organize (Weinburg 1971). But first, greater equality must be achieved in financing to insure the effectiveness of the smaller districts (Singleton 1975).

The entire argument of community control is best summarized by Kenneth Clark (quoted in Weinburg 1971) where he states the issue of control is "a demand for school accountability by parents to whom the schools have never accounted, particularly those parents of low status groups in northern cities." Ultimately the issue may best be resolved by an alliance between teachers and parents (Hunt 1976).

Summary

In sum, the literature on community concerns is extensive, particularly on busing and white flight. The quantitative studies are restricted to the areas of anticipated events such as scheduled busing programs in which attitudes of parents and changes in student performance can be measured. Many studies are longitudinal analyzing the community conflict, factionalism, decision making, the position or role of elites. There are a number of studies of conflicts generated by community involvement or protests in the administration of the schools where the data are gathered post hoc through interviews of critical informants. The nature of the issues seems to restrict these studies to qualitative analysis. Some attempts to quantify conflict might be interesting but would not seem to be particularly promising. Recent commentary indicates a general need for studies of black communities where real political power has been achieved through demographic changes in large cities (e.g., Atlanta; Newark). It has been noted, for example, that the civil rights lawyers are no longer in touch with the changing attitudes of blacks in these new situations.

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION

Dilemma

One of the educational issues most often raised in the process of desegregation concerns the responsiveness of educators to make decisions necessary to successfully implement change. While school administrators have acted to initiate programs to rectify the segregated aspects of inner-city life, it is argued that these ameliorative curriculums have only reinforced inequality (Berlowitz 1974; Rist 1972). Lower-class ghetto children have previously been educated in neighborhood schools, isolated from the larger, more predominant cultural patterns, yet expected to achieve according to the standards set forth by the majority system (Levine 1972). Inasmuch as segregated black neighborhood schools often had equal teaching staffs and materials when compared to similar white schools (Coleman 1966), the overall quality of resources devoted to education of minority children and white children was (and is) greatly in favor of the latter (Berlowitz 1974; Clignet 1974). As a result, says Stewart (1965), efforts to desegregate schools to provide equal education have initiated modified programs to suit disadvantaged children and often are perceived to do injustice to advantaged children. When whites speculate that the quality of education for their children is declining, they have often opposed busing to achieve equal education (Cataldo, Giles and Gatlin 1975). Administrators are thus caught in controversy between white parents, who perceive education as declining in quality, and minority communities, who view their education as innately inferior.

Response

If, as Rist (1973) maintains, education is a form of secular religion, then administrators, teachers and counselors act as priests. The failure of some administrators, teachers, etc. to respond to crisis in the school environment indicates that they are well satisfied with the "faith" of the educational institution and that problems encountered are due to individual attributes found in protesting students and surrounding communities. In fact, many school personnel maintain that there are not any problems (Winecoff and Kelly 1971). Also, principals and teachers in minority schools often isolate themselves from their students by opening social distance and classifying ethnic minorities with stereotypes, and are thus blinded to real issues in the schools which affect both students and the community. If problems are recognized, they are often viewed as political by school boards (Ziegler and Boss 1974) especially if civil rights activity in the locale is high. Nevertheless, community involvement appears to be the major catalyst in revising school policy (Fuchs 1966; Ziegler and Boss 1974). When school boards do respond to community demands for change, consensus in the literature seems to suggest that the principal is the most important person in the school hierarchy regarding successful transition of the educational process. In the midst of school controversy, the principal is often the man in the middle (Turbowitz 1971; Levy 1970) and may be defined as saviour or scapegoat, depending on the community perspective. Abney (1974) reports that black principals are often demoted to assistant positions or back to classroom teaching as desegregation is accomplished. When race is the issue, Cottle (1970) states that the black principal is abused and outraged in every event and is handicapped in administrative decision making by constant criticism. Although black administrators are singled out for criticism, especially by whites, many principals are under fire for statements or procedures defined as racist by the local community. Fuchs in *Pickets at the Gates* (1966) cites a case study in which a white principal inflamed the surrounding parent population by giving a letter of instruction to incoming teachers warning them of certain class-linked student characteristics which would have to be compensated for. In this case, the school board backed the parents and the principal, dazed by the controversy, amended his remarks.

A very major concern of school administrators is the application of discipline in maintaining a proper educational environment. As Rist (1972) points out, the greatest consideration given is not whether to use violence, but when to use it. Principals, teachers, counselors and custodians are involved in the cycle of the school milieu in which a crisis atmosphere determines the learning experience which, in turn, affects the response of teachers and the principal, providing the general social themes of the school (Rist 1972). Administrators, acting under the assumption that disruption is bad and what is being disrupted is good, leave things alone until school problems reach crisis proportions (Redl 1975). This cautious stance is often cited in the literature (Stewart 1965; Fish 1970; Bailey 1971; Shreck, Harper and Goroff 1975). Inability or unwillingness to take innovative action to rectify violent school situations may be a function of the position of administrators in the institution of education. As Reimer (1970) states, administrators are prisoners of their own institutions, barely accomplishing educational missions before turning around and bowing to them. Reverence for the efficiency of education is not confined to principals and board members, however. Guidance personnel routinely advise lower-class children to take educational courses which are assumed to be beneficial and interesting, but actually are class related (Rist 1973). Counselors give their advice to students assuming that they are acting in humane, egalitarian ways which the code of educational standards calls for. Actually, counselors channel lower-class students into dead-end courses, thus limiting their job futures (Smith 1971). As Borey, Dunn and Bass (1971) point out, socialization of the lower-class student affects the counseling relationship, but Smith (1971) would reply that the middle-class socialization of the counselor would be more of a determinant factor in the implications for career direction of the youth. Counselors may be instrumental in determining career patterns, but the economic dead end resulting from class-linked or subsidiary occupational choices would explain a high degree of dissatisfaction on the part of communities with educational outcomes. The obvious controversy over benefits of education thus falls back into the laps of principals, superintendents and school boards.

Change

Insofar as the school administration is unwilling to deal with controversy without great public pressure, response to that pressure and action for constructive change usually can occur through an activist principal, especially when bolstered by staff support (Fish 1970; Orfield 1975; Goldsborough 1971; Levine 1972; Bailey 1971). Much of the literature indicates that an activist principal is able to elicit greater support through community involvement, establishment of open channels of communication with the client public, students and teachers, and by evolving strategies of crisis prevention rather than intervention (Bailey 1971; Schreck, Harper and Goroff 1975; Stewart 1965; Goldsborough 1971; Orfield 1975). Any large scale system-wide attempt at change must be accompanied by adequate sources of information for all administrators concerned. The failure of the Clark Plan in Washington was apparently partly due to the ignorance of many teachers, administrators and members of the community of the changes, techniques and goals of the plan (Cuban 1970). Thus, the school administrators should pass down the line enough information to elicit support and adequate understanding of changes implemented.

Some literature suggests, however, that commitment to change on the part of administrators is insufficient without concomitant cultural/structural changes within the school system (Fuchs 1969; Hillson 1967; Stewart 1965). As Rist (1972) suggests, American education is structured to perpetuate social and economic inequalities found within society. Berlowitz (1974) agrees that schools reinforce inequality through inferior teaching staffs. Educators, imbued with the ethos of middle-class America, develop controlling attitudes and methods of thought; intending to impress upon all the myths of educational and occupational opportunity (Bergen 1968). School process then may be viewed as cultural imperialism, with ghetto children as the population to be colonized. Learning is, thus, organized to maintain the established order, and poverty and addiction as well as disruptive violence are viewed as individual failings, not structural defects (Carnoy 1974). The drift of these arguments would indicate that as long as schools act as a sorting device for society, administrative efforts at educational change on a large scale are probably doomed. Problems of schooling are problems contained in the greater context of American society and despite the efforts of active administrators, the literature suggests that little permanent change will be produced from efforts within the current system (Sexton 1968).

Summary

The research on the administration of desegregated schools has mostly concentrated upon examining the role of the professional in the context of disruptive school environments. Some descriptions of administrative process in non-crisis settings would seem to help set the stage for an understanding of the relationship of administrative procedures and crisis. But particularly, it would seem that a major area of needed research concerns the perceived powerlessness of administrators, particularly principals. As will be discussed in the conclusions for the order and discipline section, alternative organizational forms and styles need to be attempted and evaluated. Schools that employ unusual governance programs need to be identified and described. Thus, an effort needs to be undertaken to compare the "success" of desegregation in various settings that employ various governance systems. Finally, it would seem that researchers need to penetrate school system offices. The place to start is with descriptive surveys and ethnographic investigations that attempt to document the logics employed within centralized administrations. Without that, the research efforts at the school level may simply be naive and misguided.

It should be noted that most of the literature on administration is commentary, and not systematic research. The few quantitative studies are not very analytic and mostly describe process and procedures. The qualitative studies are more analytic, but waiver between seeing the problem as inept administration or an incorrigible institution.

ORDER AND DISCIPLINE

One of the more frequent recurring themes in current literature pertaining to desegregated education is that of order and discipline in the schools. Maintaining peace in the school, however, entails more than the matter of corporal punishment of unruly children. Instead, the literature suggests that school violence in the present context of education, involves two similar but distinguishable phenomena: 1) student mass protest over issues dealing with school or larger societal problems; and 2) individual acts of personal violence or property damage which symbolize rejection of school orientations. As Friedenburg (1971) suggests, the former type of activity indicates to educators the existence of an ideological bases while the individualistic disruption is indicative of mere mischief.

Student Protest

Libarle (1970) points out many students are being denied basic rights and freedoms guaranteed under the constitution. In protest, students see the redistribution of wealth and resources as the most critical and necessary event in solving their other problems. The most critical protest issues among student populations concern racial discrimination, and secondly, the forms of discrimination leveled at all students. These protest concerns as well reflect wider community anxiety over the quality of education. As Fuchs (1966) suggests, when administrators initiate special services, they forget that assumptions about students, based upon general neighborhood background, do not necessarily concern the individual needs of the students. School programs instituted to ameliorate lower class learning deficiencies often outrage the local community. And their anger is often incorporated into civil rights protest which may include demands for personnel changes. Furthermore, Levy (1970) in *Ghetto School* clearly indicates the implied undertone of violence which characterizes schools in controversy. Such an implied threat is also described in Schreck, Harper and Goroff (1975) and Rist (1972).

In schools where educational policy is resented, students perceive educators as merely attempting to maintain control rather than aiding in educational opportunity (Haney and Zimbardo 1975). School controversy over policy results when a gap exists between the actual accomplishments of curriculum plans and the expectations of students. Violence thus reflects dissatisfaction with educational process which promises the myth of social mobility but allows only an increasing concern for regularity, order and discipline (Levy, 1970). Classroom situations mirror this gap between expectations and realization, in that instructors apply teaching methods stressing compensation for the disadvantaged, and students resist such methods due to their alienation about educational outcomes (Hickerson 1966). Further characterizing such schools with alienated student populations is a cycle of violence and response to violence in which frequent incidents of violence determine administrative and teacher responses, thereby shaping the learning experiences of students, further alienating them and producing more violence (Rist 1972).

Individual Mischief

Turning to forms of individualistic misbehavior from issues of mass protest in the school, it appears that vandalism and disruption are again manifestations of unequal outcomes of education for different groups of students. In the context of classroom interaction, instructors perceive disruptive children to be, and assume that disruption is, bad and what is being disrupted is good. Unruly children must be separated for the good of the class. Quick identification and separation of disruptive students are positive attributes for teachers who desire to hold instructive classes (Redl 1975). By singling out the disruptive child into special programs and courses, the school is able to maintain order and at the same time reinforce status differentiation of those who rock the boat. Vandalism is particularly distressful to school staffs since property destruction is a direct rejection of educational efforts to socialize students about norms pertaining to patriotism, acceptance of discipline and value of consumptive property (Friedenberg 1971).

Order in Schools

Strategies for the control of vandalism as suggested by Koch (1975) range from writing off the problem as insoluble to technological innovation (such as bugging) to removal of crimogenic causation through societal change. Koch claims that consideration of issues about school violence must involve balancing the claims of society as a whole versus the needs of individual students. He argues that adequate control strategies may not be discovered until all levels of control are examined, be they cultural, societal, community, familial or individual. Increasing administration intervention in problem-riddled schools reflects concern that is manifested by greater preoccupation with control.

Control in schools has been described as similar to that found in prisons. Haney and Zimbardo (1975) make analogies between principals as wardens and students as inmates. They view schools as nearly total institutions, controlling the lives of students by determining dress, behavior and movement during the school day. As a means of control, methods of corporal punishment or some form of exclusion are used to align student behavior with institutional guidelines. The more extreme form of exclusion is that of school suspension, and more so than whites, black students have been singled out for separation from school environment (see Bell 1972 and Lillian Clarke 1973; Yudof 1975).

As Friedenberg (1971) notes, dealing with problems of school violence, disruption and protest on the part of administrators does not occur until their positions are threatened. When community involvement over controversial problems brings pressure on school principals, superintendents, and boards of education, some activity to resolve the matter will begin. Ziegler and Boss (1974) report school board members and superintendents are generally insensitive to social problems because of their rational ideology of education. In theory if not in practice, this precludes racial distinctions. Generally the civil rights movement has been mostly symbolic and has clouded the issues in school controversy. On the level of individual schools, Rist (1972), Levy (1970), Turbowitz (1971) and Fuchs (1966) suggest that principals are often caught in a crossfire between board pressure, community pressure, and faculty discontent when facing school crises. To alleviate this dilemma, Stewart (1965) suggests that greater skill in crisis prevention (rather than intervention), careful perception of community standards of education and needs, and restructuring school environments should be considered. An excellent example of constructive change with these measures is provided in a study by Schreck, Harper and Goroff (1975) which describes community-wide involvement fostered by an open, highly visible administration committed to change. In one year, violence was decreased and differences between various student populations were aired without recourse to disruption.

Summary

As with other issue areas reviewed in this paper, there seems to be a paucity of systematic research and commentary upon order and discipline in the desegregated school. It would seem particularly important to compare the variety of administrative styles and the receptiveness of desegregated school settings to them. Also, the consequences of order and discipline procedures need more study. Some students are pushed out of school via a combination of academic failure and disciplinary procedures, and it would certainly seem this is more often the case with minority students. Along with the study of consequences, it would seem necessary to systematically investigate the dimensions of commitment of students. What is it about school that some students do not act out and others do? Some research has looked at this and argued that commitment is a function of reaping the benefits, immediate and long range, of the institution. Yet studies in interracial settings are noticeably few. Finally, the literature argues that even the principal feels powerless. Field studies and experiments need to be undertaken with the expressed aim of maximizing the power of all school participants and assessing the academic and discipline consequences.

Current literature concerning order and discipline in America's school system emphasizes the accessibility of school administrations to student overtures as directly varying with the school's milieu of controversy. The first form of literature, qualitative designs, are questioning the very basis of American education and conclusions reached at the end of those studies appear to confirm the suspicions raised. Secondly, those studies utilizing quantitative data are divided over basic conceptual outlook but they suggest that administrators are fatalistic concerning their positions vis a vis student violence and political pressures, and that no matter who was in their position, little could be done. This sense of powerlessness with the present situation is indicative of framework similar to those reached in qualitative designs, that structural and or social change may be necessary before the crises in schools is past. Finally the commentative literature is more focused upon the matter of issues in the schools, rather than schools being the issue. They suggest that administrators can effect change if significant pressure is brought to bear. Essay articles in general are more optimistic about school outcomes although much controversy and pain are seen as concomitants to successful crisis revolution.

CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

Instructional Materials

It has been argued that more than school and classroom desegregation, compensatory educational programs and additional resource dollars will be needed if we are to reach our goal of equal opportunity and equal outcomes of education. Every child must have an equal chance to participate in the learning process, be fairly depicted in the textbooks and receive a rightful share of school resources, including time and attention from the teacher. At present there are practices within the educational system which serve to restrict some children's learning process. Allen (1971) and McLaurin (1971) found that state-approved courses and supplementary textboods, written post 1954, being used in several southern states show an inadequate and prejudiced picture of Negroes. Texts written from 1961 on, ignored the lower-class black family, always depicting the black as a loner. In this way the informal social learning of white children about blacks is sanctioned and buttressed by formal education. Research by Caliguri and Levine (1968) with suburban educators found that very few school districts had written policies encouraging teachers to use inter-ethnic material and very little support was given to those who tried to use more and better instructional material of this type. Teachers (Caliguri 1971 & Levine Noar 1966) complained of poor quality of inter-ethnic material in social studies texts and expressed the need for more illustrations of integrated human groupings and settings and the portrayal of minority groups in a more positive light.

Tracking

Historically, the poor image of lower class and minorities are depicted in textbooks has also been the image used by schools to determine the educational experience of these children (Crimmins 1974). The educational track system (Clark 1964; Rist 1970; Schafer and Olexa 1971) discriminates against low-income minority groups by locking-in students to a particular educational or career line. These children come to school less well prepared for learning than their middle-class peers and because they have more to learn in the same period of time, teachers label them as "slow learners" (Hickerson 1966). In the third or fourth grade, students are given standardized tests which are used as the formal basis for tracking. Lower-class children are deliberately channeled into the lower track programs that offer curriculum which, in most cases, is poorly planned, academically weak, and basically uncoordinated (Eddy 1967). When children in the same classroom are placed in different tracks special adaptations are made in the regular curriculum so the lower track children undertake less work and are given more time to do it under the assumption that these children are "disadvantaged." The curriculum offering for upper track students is more advanced or supplementary to the normal instructional material which emphasizes specific kinds of knowledge and work skills.

Tracking reinforces failure for those who have done poorly in the past, both through curriculum offering and because teachers spend more time with the upper track students

(Hickerson 1966; Moore 1964; Stein 1971; Clark 1965; Hodgkinson 1961; Levy 1970). Slow learners are not fooled (McCullough 1974). They know when they are being discriminated against by being given "slow work" and often balk at doing the assignment. In so doing, they fulfill the teachers' expectations of them by failing to learn. Thus schools succeed in inducing and perpetuating the pathology they claim to remedy.

The children do not understand to what extent their failure is institutionalized and semiautomatic, nor are they aware of the political significance (Levy 1970; Stein 1971). Income and occupation of the father are almost as good as IQ test scores in predicting whether youth will go to college. The educational system is geared to the needs of children from middle-class environments (Hodgkinson 1967). The system is structured through tests, reward systems and required behavior patterns to allow children of the middle class to do well and to filter out the poor (Carnoy 1974; Gintis 1971; Dreeben 1968). At each grade level, curriculum is "modified" to teachers' images of what children can be expected to do (Stein 1971). Moreover pupils in lower track courses are further demoralized by the widespread grading policy in high schools. Lower track students often cannot receive a grade higher than "C" or "B" no matter how hard they try, nor how completely they master the material available to them (Hickerson 1966).

As soon as the child reaches sixteen years of age, the teacher's task is lightened. The simplest way of not teaching the child is to get him out of school through the insidious "incentive or social promotion" practice (Stein 1971). As Hickerson (1966) states, "Children of deprived background who do manage to graduate from high school are seldom better off for completing this ordeal because schools have equipped them with few saleable skills" (cf., Ogbu 1974).

One of the major causes of children not being taught is that neither teachers, principals, superintendents nor Boards of Examiners who set the criteria for evaluation are accountable for the success or failure in teaching children. Educational personnel feel that their "professionalism" puts them above being accountable.

Summary

Research that looks at curriculum and instruction has not focused upon the question: how do you provide instruction for all students. Rather the literature is permeated with discourse on how to best teach the minority student. In public education today that focus is reflected in the development of separate special programs and ability grouping. The literature reviewed here is critical of tracking and special programs, but little effort has been devoted to how best to teach all students.

A second issue that is addressed in the section on consequences of interracial schooling also needs to be reinterated here. There are few studies that look at the long-range consequences of tracking and instructional techniques. Further, there is a dire need, particularly when they concern the resegregation of desegregated schools, to examine the changes made after desegregation and the logics that support those modifications, even comparative descriptions of classrooms that are desegregated and segregated as a result of whatever logic are needed. These descriptions need to focus not as much as on teacher behavior, but qualitative assessments of the teachers' messages that are conveyed via his/her teaching methodology and upon how much substantive knowledge is being provided.

Generally, the literature reviewed here is critical of current curriculum and instruction procedures. There was little distinction in the conceptual frameworks employed in the quantitative studies, qualitative studies and commentaries.

There is some doubt as to whether the research reviewed here is representative, since it would seem that there must be considerable literature supporting tracking and special instructional approaches for minority students. It is possible that much of this literatuare is couched as "special education," etc., which is not reviewed in this paper. If this is true, this would indicate that there are at least two discrete themes in the literature. One assumes that special programs hinder; the other, that they help. But more importantly, the latter sees students as having deficiencies, while the former assumes education does.

FACULTY

Teachers and Desegregation

Teachers play a critical role in determining the success or failure of desegregated education for they deal on a daily basis with problems in integration of race and class. Orfield (1975) has written that desegregation is often a traumatic experience, especially for white teachers, because they are forced to cope with their personal prejudices as well as with problems that may arise in teaching children with different backgrounds.

Thus far researchers have paid little attention to the effect of desegregation on teachers. Anderson (1958) in writing of early school desegregation in Tennessee says that teachers were at a loss as to what to do for they had received not one hour of training in race relations from the university. In their reports of results from desegregated workshops Agee and Smith (1974), Stein (1971) and Preston and Robinson (1974) say that teachers indicated a reduction in anxiety over working in a biracial situation due to the workshop experiences. Many white teachers had classical stereotypes of blacks shattered and participants evidenced a noticeable change for the better in their behavior toward each other. However, there are no follow-up studies to indicate what impact workshops make in the classroom behavior of teachers.

Teaching Minorities

Middle-class teachers have traditionally discriminated against students in terms of socioeconomic class (Alsworth and Woock 1970; Hickerson 1966; Silberman 1970; Herndon 1968; Clark 1964). Children of racial and ethnic minorities are seen as lower-class so the desegregation process did not necessitate a revision in methods of classifying children—blacks were simply lumped into "lower-class" and teachers went on with "business as usual." Callahan (1965) and Kvaraceus (1971) say that schools are indeed a business operated with the expressed purpose of realizing the greatest return for the least amount of investment. Rist (1973) has portrayed the school as a "factory where children go to fail." Teachers act like job-oriented workers, leaving shortly after students in the afternoon, rather than profession-oriented educators who might use the time to search for new and better ways of teaching (Leacock 1969; Libarle and Seligson 1970). Workers in factories have been described as feeling alienated from management much as Clark (1970) describes the distance maintained by teachers in their dealings with "those children." It is argued that no effort is made to establish a humanitarian atmosphere in the classroom or to interact with students on an individual basis. Haskins (1969) in his *Diary of a Harlem School Teacher* says that faculty members in some desegregated schools do not speak to each other even on a professional basis. In schools where teachers do talk to each other the conversations are usually limited to the passing on of derogatory information about students (Clark 1970). Thelen (1954) argues that rather than being liberators, teachers are more often taskmasters occupied with giving out tasks set by bureaucratic supervisors. Teachers feel a lack of power and influence in determining educational matters in their schools so teachers' unions have been formed (Alsworth and Woock 1970; Fish 1970) in some cities to act as bargaining agents in matters of pay, due process and equal rights. When teachers express desires for gestures of appreciation from lower-class parents the parents are quick to point out that teachers receive pay and fringe benefits for their work and should not expect gratitude as well (Ogbu 1974).

The educational system from kindergarten through college has the means to sort out those who do not conform. Prospective teachers, no matter how intelligent or highly motivated, must fit into institutional frameworks and display correct ideologies as determined by key personnel in schools of education or they will not be awarded teaching credentials (Bergen 1968). Newly trained young teachers with the desire to help children are soon socialized by older teachers into traditional methods of teaching and thinking. Rist (1973), Levy

(1970), McCullough (1974), Eddy (1967) and Herndon (1968) depict the most important function of the teacher as the maintaining of control. Those who do fail to do so are faced with loss of esteem in the eyes of principals and other teachers because maintaining control is seen as being synonymous with educating. As means to establish control, teachers inflict both mental and physical pain on students (Clark 1965; McCullough 1974). As a result of this atmosphere of impending violence, schools often add to the confusion they are trying to prevent. A bigoted, belligerent teacher can bring students' resentments to the boiling point resulting in war in the classroom.

One way in which teachers view their relationships with students and parents is that of patron-client (Ogbu 1974; Levy 1970; Fuchs 1969). Their purpose is to raise the students out of lower-class life and turn them into middle-class taxpayers. Teachers decide when and on what basis they will meet with parents and though there are often conflicts (parent-teacher) about teaching and learning stereotypes, the lower-class parents seldom vocalize their objections because they need what the teachers have to offer and have little power to press their point. These parents often avoid contact with teachers because teachers "make them feel dumb." Parents are not considered qualified to make judgments about their own children. Teachers reject ideas or suggestions parents might venture as to why their children are having school-related problems or what approach might be used to help the children.

Middle-class teachers experience difficulty in identifying with different values of lower-class and/or culturally different children. Rather than trying to effect cultural change, it has been argued that teachers should try to be conscious of, as well as understand and respect, cultural differences (Hillson 1967; Adams 1966; Fuchs 1969; Greene 1974; Woodworth and Salzer 1971; Anderson 1958; Prichard 1969; Orstein 1971; Wiles 1970; Alsworth and Woock 1970; Levenson 1968). Clark (1971:98) sums up this line of thought quite well when he says

> The answer to the problem is to get personnel of public schools . . . to address themselves to their responsibility, teaching children, teaching human beings. Data shows perspective, degree of literacy of teachers in understanding the nature and characteristics of human differences is no higher than that of the general public.

Teacher Attitudes

The major thrust of the literature having to do with teachers is centered around judgments teachers make about students and some of the results of those judgments. The teacher establishes the social role structure of the classroom. Students perceive this role, act out the role and in so doing become locked into it. Thus, this teacher-assigned role becomes a "self-fulfilling prophecy" (Entwisle and Webster 1974) for the child. Teachers make value judgments of children by October of the first year at school (Hickerson 1966) on the basis of extra-school factors such as race, status of parents, appearance which have nothing to do with the child's ability to learn (Rist 1972). Middle-class teachers' prejudgments that lower-class and minority children will be less successful academically than the white, middle-class child determines the entire school future of these children (Alsworth and Woock 1970; Clark 1964). The prejudices of teachers against the lower-class child (Woodworth and Salzer 1971; Eddy 1967; Clark 1965) have a direct effect on how the child learns. Wiles (1970) reports that teachers' attitudes toward pupils differ with racial and economic composition and type of school. This results in unequal distribution of educational opportunity (Hillson 1967; Moore 1964) and school rewards with lower-class children receiving the smaller share.

Summary

Unfortunately, there seems to be little study of how desegregation has affected teachers, their attitudes and classroom behavior. Even basic research addressing the relationship of teacher attitudes and actual behavior has not been systematically undertaken. It would seem significant to understand how teachers have modified their approaches to teaching, education, the sponsorship of co-curricular activities, and students in general after schools were desegregated. Another area of needed research concerns teacher relationships with administration and teacher-to-teacher relations in desegregated schools. Unionization and its meaning in desegregated school systems would also seem to need more study. Universally, this research needs to be comparative and utilize a variety of research methods.

The existing literature on teachers seems to be mostly commentary which sees the teachers as a problem. These works argue that better teachers, better teacher training and more resources will make teachers more responsive to minority students. The qualitative research is less optimistic and argues that while teachers need training and assistance, the major problem is in the organization of the institution. The teachers are more-or-less caught up in the institutional logic. There is little quantitative research, mostly evaluations of attempts to change teacher attitudes or counting of teacher-student interactions. The conceptual frameworks employed in the quantitative studies seem to represent both teachers as the problem and the institution as the problem analyses, without a clear tendency for either.

EXTRASCHOOL FACTORS

There is no little debate over the effect of extraschool factors upon interracial schooling. In fact, this debate would seem to be *the* debate that needs resolving before a uniform policy and implementation strategy on the interracial education can be designed. However, it appears that few will be giving ground in their stances. The assumptions of each of these schools seem irreconcilable with those of the other. The debate seems to have centered almost exclusively on the effects of extraschool factors upon academic achievements, and the discussion here will be limited to that subject. Other extraschool factors and other dependent variables are included in other sections of this review.

The first two schools of thought, what will be called "innate ability" and "cultural deprivation," both consider extraschool factors to be primary in explaining success or failure in an academic environment. The third school of thought which will be called "school contingencies" for the lack of a better term, argues that they are not as significant as the others have proposed, if significant at all. This distinction, however, should not lead one to conclude that innate ability proponents and cultural deprivation proponents are essentially similar in outlook. While both consider extraschool factors to be significant, they do not agree on how to explain the significance of extraschool factors or to what degree proposed solutions can overcome the extraschool factors.

Innate ability

The first school of thought to be discussed, innate ability, posits that the failure of minority students to succed in school is due to genetic deficiencies of minorities. For example, the works of Jensen (1969; 1970) and Eysenck (1971) propose that there is little that can be done to increase the academic achievement of blacks either through desegregation of schools or through remedial programs, although the latter, of course, certainly could be used to help minorities maximize the attainment of their limited potential.

Most of the works that have developed this theme have based their conclusions upon the changes or lack of enduring changes in I.Q. test scores, their measure of innate ability. While it seems impossible at this point in time to empirically demonstrate the existence or non-existence of innate differences in ability, many have taken the genetic argument to task for its use of I.Q. tests as measures of ability (Lundberg 1939; Montague 1970; Rist 1970; Husen 1972; Richardson, Spears and Richards 1972; Labov 1970; Heber 1969). These works have critiqued the genetic studies on the bases, among others, of a misuse of the concept of race, seeming ignorance of linguistics, and poor sampling techniques. While these critiques are formidable, I.Q. scores have continued to be used as indicators of genetic ability. Jencks et al. (1972) estimates, for example, that genes explain about 45 percent of the variance in test scores. Yet even in that reasoned study, there is no genetic evidence, rather just social indicators that are assumed to be reflective of hereditary differences.

The literature suggesting that innate ability accounts for the lack of successful negotiation of the process of schooling by minorities seems to lack credibility. Richardson Spears and Richards (1972), for example, argue that before there can be "... a realistic debate about individual differences in intellectual performance, we need two things—a description of intelligence and an adequate theory of its mode of development" (p. 181). This has not been forthcoming, and thus it seems that until an adequate understanding of, and means of ascertaining cognitive differences are found, it would seem best to assume, as Pearl (1972) advocates, that for both policy and research purposes, most students come into the school system relatively homogeneous in innate ability.

Cultural Deprivation

There are others who also see minority students entering school with deficiencies. Yet they understand them not to be the result of genetic heritage, but rather the consequences of being raised in an environment that does not provide a child with the background necessary to achieve in school. It is argued that deficiencies in minority background such as little attention or encouragement from parents (Fraser 1959; Dave 1963; Wolf 1964), poor time orientation, perceptual deficits (Chilman 1967; Gottleib 1967), inability to reason abstractly and use of a logically inferior dialect (Bernstein 1961; Bereiter and Englemann 1966), and scarcity of books and encyclopedias in the home along with parents' reading deficiencies (Fraser 1959; Coleman 1966; Gottleib 1967) are the major causes of educational underachievement among minority students. The logic of this school of thought finds support in interpreting the Coleman Report as indicating that the more significant aspect of the schooling process is, in fact, the students themselves. That is, schools that have predominantly white, middle-class students, it is argued, will benefit minority students because the middle-class student will enrich the environment of the minority child and thus help counteract his/her "deprivation" due to cultural background (Moynihan 1968). There is some concern over whether or not cultural deprivation is primarily due to racial or social class background. However, it seems that the factors are interactive (Coleman 1966) with race being the more salient factor (Jencks 1972) in explaining achievement scores. However, social class seems to explain more variance in dropout rates, which would seem to be an indicator of school commitment. Race continues, however, to be more significant when looking only at nonwhite-collar youths (Coleman 1966).

Cultural deprivation has also received much criticism. Among the most cogent of these criticisms are the use in many of these studies of middle-class criteria for assessing deficiencies in the home life of less than middle-class students (Baratz and Baratz 1970; Ginsberg 1972); misuse of the concepts of "culture" and "deprivation" (Valentine 1968; Keddie 1973); ignorance of the linguistic structure of nonstandard dialects (Labov 1970); and the use of traditional instruments and measures such as I.Q. scores in assessing alleged pre-school differences between students (Ryan 1965; Cicourel 1974). It appears that this school of thought suffers, as does the innate ability school, from a lack of theory about when differences between people constitutes deficiencies and when they are, in fact, just differences. Thus, cognitive styles vary; but the only base cultural deprivation proponents use for comparison is a somehow monolithic white, middle-class culture. They seemingly have grossly underrepresented even the heterogeniety present in the white, middle-classes.

School Contingencies

The many critiques of both the innate ability and cultural deprivation themes seem to have led to the recent emergence of a new school of thought—one which has yet to evolve a recognized name for itself. However, inasmuch as this school of thought emphasizes not extraschool factors but the contingencies that the institution of formal education creates for the heterogeneous mass that is processed each year in the name of teaching and learning, an appropriate name may be "school contingencies." The origins of the school of thought seems to have been with the "labeling perspective" that came into vogue in the 1960's. (cf. Rosenthal and Jacobsen 1968; Cicourel and Kitsuse 1963; Schafer and Olexa 1971; Friedenberg 1965; Henry 1963) and the emergence of black critiques of the educational process (cf. Clark, 1964, 1965) These work argued that success in school is dramatically affected by the organization of learning experience. Major emphasis has been placed on the effects of ability grouping and tracking (Rosenbaum 1975; Rist 1973; Henry 1963) the social class context of the school (Wilson 1968; Coleman 1966), and the quality of teachers and facilities (Coleman 1966).

Critics, however, argue that this perspective is naive and does not take into account the special needs of minority youth (Jensen 1970). It appears that systematic criticism has been abated, since few critiques are found in the literature, by a series of historical analyses (Katz 1971; Karier, Vidas and Spring 1973; Greer, 1972; Tyack 1974) that demonstrated that public schooling was not intended to be a mobility device for the poor, but rather a means of training the masses while maintaining social stratification.

Thus, a charge that might be leveled by proponents of the cultural deprivation perspective that students need school skills and attitudes in order to experience social mobility was neutralized.

This emerging perspective is arguing traditional analyses that have found family background to be more relevant to school success than school characteristics have misconceptualized the character of the institution. Instead of being a passive agent that simply accepts the raw material in the form of students and does what it can, this school of thought sees the school as an avid actor that makes assumptions and acts upon them. Race and social class are important in this school of thought only because the *school* assumes they are and is organized to act upon that assumption.

Summary

There can be little synthesis of the research concerning the role of extraschool factors in promoting or denying academic success at this point in time. The perspectives are simply too divergent in assumptions for this to occur until the assumptions themselves are rigorously tested. It seems that considerable emphasis for new research and thought needs to be put upon innovative, but rigorous, attempts at developing theories and descriptions of intelligence. This is long overdue. Further, research needs to be conducted with the goal of ascertaining how it is that social class and schooling interact. The more ethnographic works seem to have been helpful in defining the school as an actor, but quantitative studies need to be undertaken that conceptualize the interaction in less deterministic ways. This would allow for an analysis of the relevance of school contingencies to student performance.

A second gap in the literature seems to be a lack of field studies and experiments that begin to specify when differences do seem to be deficiencies, if ever, and under what conditions are deficiencies responsible to remediation. Particular emphasis should be placed upon cataloging cognitive styles of students and school personnel with a direct charge to look at the variety of styles that individual school participants use in everyday life. Thus, it may be discernible when a student is truly lacking in some skills and when a student is portraying a cognitive styles as a response to a setting (Cicourel et al. 1974).

Thirdly, qualitative assessments are needed of the effect of local neighborhood economics upon the quality of education. If an economically depressed area suddenly experiences a surge in employment, what is the effect upon school processes, student outlook and actions, teacher attitudes and actions, and parental involvement?

In surveying the distribution of literature according to the three major themes, there does seem to be a relationship between the type of research conducted and the conceptual framework used in explaining the role of extraschool factors. While none of the conceptual frameworks utilized only one type of research methodology, it appears that more quantitative approaches lend themselves to the innate ability and cultural deprivation perspectives, even though a significant body of this literature is simply descriptive commentary. The school contingencies perspective tended to use more qualitative methodologies, both historical and observational.

CONSEQUENCES FOR STUDENTS

The predicted consequences of interracial schooling is a part of the debate over the role of extra-school factors in school success. The concern over the effect of the mixing of races in the public school for the children is seemingly a major issue deserving of a separate discussion. The consequences to be discussed here concern four issues: academic achievement, self-confidence, racial prejudice, and career consequences. The discussion of the first three will rely heavily upon St. John's (1975) review of quantitative studies, and will be done in two sections—one reviews her conclusions across all three issues, and the second discusses the qualitative research and commentary frameworks used to explain the three issues. The last issue, career consequences, will review a small amount of literature that attempts to document the consequences of interracial schooling for entrance into the world of work.

St. John's Review

Academic achievement. The Coleman report (1966) reported one finding that has been the basis of much of the reasoning behind federally mandated desegregation of schools. Particularly, the report argued that the academic achievement of black students is higher in desegregated schools. The attempts at replicating this finding are many. Yet, St. John (1975) in her review of quantitative studies that address this issue, ends up arguing that adequate data have not yet been gathered to determine if there exists a causal relationship between the racial composition of a school and the academic achievement of the students. However, she highlights some trends. First, "... desegregation has rarely lowered academic achievement for either black or white children" (p. 36). Second, city size or region does not seem to affect the influence (or lack of systematic influence) of desegregation on achievement. Third, it appears that kindergarten age children reap more academic achievement benefits than do older children. Fourth, gains, when observed, are more usual in mathematical than in verbal achievement. Fifth, the method of desegregation, i.e., busing, "natural," redistricting, etc., does not seem to determine whether or not gains in academic achievement are to be forthcoming, although this last matter has had little systematic study.

Self-confidence. St. John (1975) reviews three commonly studied psychological outcomes of interracial education: anxiety, self-concept, and aspirations. For anxiety a common finding is that black children have a generally higher anxiety level than whites, but placement in an interracial education setting does not seem to increase the level of anxiety.

Rosenberg and Simmons (1971) also argue that there is essentially no difference by race in the self-esteem of youth. St. John's review argues that there is little evidence that points to a rise in self-esteem among blacks that results from the desegregation of schools. The evidence also suggests that the self images of girls and lower class youth are more vulnerable in interracial schools, desegregated faculties help raise self-concept, and that controversy over desegregation may raise black self-esteem because of the high morale of the black community that engages in such controversy. All in all, however, in the short-run school desegregation seems to have more of a negative or mixed than positive effect upon academic self-concept and more generalized self-esteem. Sense of control, however, is never negatively related to the white percentage of the school. Further, in the long-run, St. John argues, desegregation in education is related to higher self-esteem.

Similar to the pattern of findings with self-esteem, it appears that quantitative studies reveal that blacks and whites have similar levels of aspirations, and that blacks in segregated schools have higher aspirations than whites. "For both educational and occupational aspirations, the relation with school percentage white tends to be negative" (St. John 1975: p. 59).

Racial prejudice. Maybe more than with the other two consequences of interracial schooling discussed, academic achievement and self-confidence, there are few systematic findings concernings the effects of interracial education upon racial relations. St. John argues, however, that desegregation does seem more beneficial to black children if racial attitudes rather than friendship is the criterion. Further, experiments, more than other quantitative research designs, are more likely to show increasing racism in white attitudes. Again younger children benefit more than older children and hostile school or community environments may account for negative results.

Other Research

The studies that St. John reviews, however, fail to answer some crucial questions. St. John notes:

> Researchers have not controlled such variables as the levels of community controversey over desegregation, the friendliness of white parents and students, the flexibility or prejudice of the staff, the content of the curriculum, or the method of teaching (p. 39);

and,

> One issue that has not been resolved is whether "realism" is an important dimension of aspiration and self-concept. Are these attitudes functional only if they are in line with the abilities of individuals and with opportunities in the social structure (p. 59);

and,

> This review of research on racial attitudes and behavior in schools indicates that desegregation sometimes reduces prejudice and promotes interracial friendship and sometimes promotes, instead, stereotyping, and interracial cleavage and conflict. An outcome so variable must be affected by circumstances other than the mere fact of desegregation (p. 85).

These concerns have been addressed, but not in an extensive series of research projects such as those St. John has reviewed. Rather these are questions that more qualitative studies have reflected upon. Not only have they critiqued many of the "objective" quantitative measures of the dependent variables, but they have also pointed to the importance of understanding that these quantitative measures are designed in each case to approximate an essentially qualitative variable. Further, a number of commentators, cf. Pearl (1972), Katz (1964) and Pettigrew (1975) have found this quantitatively dominated segment of research to be missing the definition of the situation in terms of such things as pluralistic or assimilative logics of integration (Rist 1974). Further, it appears that both commentators and qualitative researchers are likely to look at behaviors and attitudes as occuring in a specific context. Thus, the works of Levy (1970), Rist (1973), Schrag (1967) and Holt (1967; 1969) all seem to point to the notion that academic achievement, self-confidence and racial attitudes of students in a desegregated educational setting are, at least in part, a function of school processes. The school's response to the presence of a minority youth is a major factor in what and how much students learn, the self-confidence and academic self-concept they portray, and the racial attitudes and friendship choices of students. A school that has within the class room ability grouping and/or curriculum tracks not only limits the information they receive, the confidence that can be portrayed "realistically," and with whom one will associate. Intriguingly, St. John in her discussion that follows the review of quantitative studies and thus allows more qualitative assessments ends up in this school of thought, which a naive reader could not have predicted from her introduction and the substance of her literature review.

Career Consequences

It is true that research on desegregated education is only about twenty years old. Yet even taking this into account, there are few studies that have attempted to assess the career consequences of youth coming from a desegregated school. This would seem to be especially needed due to the arguments by some whites that the quality of education is suffering after desegregation. Yet, St. John could only find one study that traced interracial schooling even into college entrance. Perry (1973) found that black students from a desegregated school program were much more likely to attend college and to attend more selective colleges than were a matched sample that attended segregated ghetto schools.

There is little denial in the literature that blacks do less well in gaining entrance to higher education or into the primary labor market. Duncan (1969) has pointed out that a black must replicate social class each generation while a white is more likely to "inherit" the social class of parents. Yet Duncan discounts the effects of quality of education as a significant factor based on his understanding of the Coleman Report (1966) that quality of education does not vary by segregated-desegregated schooling as much as has been thought, and his argument that the quantitative measures actually are correlative with assessments of quality. Harrison (1972), from a more critical perspective, agrees with Duncan, and argues that the variable is not inferior education but the infatuation of employers with credentials. His evidence demonstrates that non-whites fair worse than whites in terms of returns for years of education.

No qualitative research was found on this subject, while some commentary has argued that the mobility of blacks is contingent upon increased education. However, Duncan's and Harrison's work point to a fallacy in this logic. Merely increasing education will not equalize blacks and whites. Efforts still need to be directed towards the economy. Yet, it appears that the role of education has not been fully resolved. The qualitative studies cited before have pointed to different educational experiences for blacks and whites, but no attempt has been made to continue ethnographies into the world of work from the school. Second, there seems to have been no research that compares the career consequences of the students in desegregated versus segregated schools, and under the variety of conditions that surround the segregation and desegregation. Lastly, little research has attempted to pinpoint how effective restructuring education may be as a mechanism to promote economic reform.

Summary

It appears that any synthesis of the existing literature on the consequences of interracial schooling would have to plead for more research. The review presented here seems to call for more research that uses ethnographic techniques as St. John (1975) suggests, to understand the definition of the situation according to the participants, and attempts to lead to the development of new indicators for quantitative studies. At the very least, studies need to utilize a variety of methods to attempt triangulation of observed results. Further, the career consequences of interracial education need comparative and experimental study. Qualitative research also needs to be undertaken to assess how education translates into entry to the world of work. That linkage seems crucial to the whole discussion of interracial education, but has not been systematically studied.

An analysis that began with discussion of extraschool factors seems reified in this issue are of consequences of interracial schooling. It seems that quantitative research and qualitative research are associated with different conceptual frameworks. Commentators are split, but seem to tend to go along with the quantitative research and argue that the consequences have to do with the characteristics of the students, while schools are seen as relatively passive processors of the raw material with which it is presented.

Qualitative researchers are not as willing to assume such a benign role for education. They emphasize that the school's responses of the presence of minority students is a critical factor in determining the educational, attitudinal and career consequences of those it serves.

SYNTHESIS AND CONCLUSIONS

Needed Research

The literature on interracial schooling seems to have one particularly salient factor—a lack of theory. St. John (1975) commented on this when looking at the quantitative outcomes of desegregation for children. Yet is is not just limited to that portion of the literature. Most of the literature on interracial schooling is policy or procedure oriented. It is "action" research without a good grounding in social theory.

This is not to say that the literature does not have some variety in conceptual frameworks, for it does. However, the research all too often does not emerge from theory or directly inform theory. Rather the conceptual frameworks overarch the research procedures, questions and interpretations and may only become evident through a close examination of the wording of the conclusions. The authors, for some reason, have not felt free to elaborate their theoretical frameworks within the context of their research. Hopefully, the development of new theory will help explain the inconclusiveness of the findings reviewed in this paper and elsewhere. St. John's (1975) attempt at theory development seems to have been a rewarding venture. More such attempts are needed.

It also seems that there is a noticeable lack of field studies that incorporate a variety of research methodologies, qualitative and quantitative. It would seem that these types of studies enable not only more generalizable results, but also results that are more closely attuned to schooling processes. These studies should certainly be comparative whenever possible.

A third area of needed research is within the classroom. As St. John (1975) notes:

> . . .far more illuminating (than quantitative studies) would be small scale studies involving anthropological observations of the process of interracial schooling, across settings diverse in black/white ratios and in middle-class/lower-class ratios, and also diverse in their educational philosophies and techniques. (pp. 122-123).

The argument is for more holistic assessments of the educational milieu that are almost by definition qualitative. After theoretically informed studies of this type, it may be possible to develop meaningful indicators for more quantitative approaches.

Another gap in the literature is the simple paucity of work on co-curricular activity. Winecoff and Kelly (1971), Petroni, Hirsch and Petroni (1970), Libarle and Seligson (1970), and St. John (1975) have indicated that desegregation of co-curricular activities may be a very touchy problem. Winecoff and Kelly (1971) comment that the more informal and social the co-curricular activity, the more difficult it may be for whites to accept. Petroni, Hirsch and Petroni (1970) and Libarle and Seligson (1970) concur when they note that one of the complaints by black students is a lack of black cheerleaders, one of Winecoff and Kelly's co-curricular activities that for whites is unacceptable to integrate. St. John (1975) argues that the social threat of desegregation is greater for black females than black males, since feminine beauty is judged by standards of white society and since black males may gain acceptance and self-confidence through athletics. However, there certainly is a need to establish the theoretical and strategic significance of co-curricular activities to the process of interracial education. Research needs to be directed, first, at qualitative understanding of the importance of co-curricular activities to the students, black and white. Following these types of investigations, an effort should be made to quantify the desegregation of co-curricular activities under a variety of school and community conditions.

More specific gaps in the literature has been noted in the summary of each section of this literature review. However, let us highlight a few of them. First, for the legal/political issue there would seem to be a need for research that documents and explains what judges and attorneys who have been involved in school desegregation cases consider credible evidence and the parameters used to assess the viability of the possible remedies. Second, research on community concerns and influence is lacking that investigates the perspectives of a variety of black communities concerning desegregation and interracial education. Hopefully, some clarity of issues will emerge from knowing the effect of new political and economic power upon the perspectives of black communities. Studies are also needed of the effect of alternative governance systems, and not just variations in administrative style, upon the process of interracial education. It also appears that research on administration needs to put emphasis upon the school system administration, particularly since desegregation may lead to more centralization of decision-making. Examination is also needed of the consequences of "law and order" in the school for students. One such consequence may well a lack of commitment to the school by students. The essential question in need of investigation is: Under which system(s), procedure(s), and/or conditions of order and discipline will students remain committed to the school?

Research efforts need directed at the most productive means by which to teach all students, regardless of background, within the classroom and the school. The special emphasis on the minority child may be counter productive to this effort. Documentation and analysis is also needed of curricular changes, and the consequences thereof, made in response to desegregation.

One area of the effects of desegregation that has been relatively ignored is the consequences for the teachers. How has desegregation affected teachers' attitudes, classroom behavior, teacher to teacher relations, and teacher-administration relations?

The most pressing need in the issue areas of extraschool factors and consequences of interracial schooling is for the development of theories and descriptions of intelligence. This may well be a futile effort, since intelligence may be only a human construct that indicates misunderstanding of other human beings. Yet the attempts need to be made. Along with this effort, or possibly in place of it, research is critically needed in the area of career consequences of schooling, and interracial schooling in particular. The most damaging consequence of desegregation may be that employers and higher education may assume without any evidence that students from desegregated schools are less qualified, and may systematically discriminate against them. Of course, the quality of a school may decline after desegregation, but if it does it would seem to be in large part due to school response to desegregation, and may not be due to the influx of minority students.

The Relationship of Conceptual Framework and Research Methodology

One of the major purposes of this literature review was to examine if there seems to be an association between research methodology and conceptual framework. Three research approaches were identified: commentary, qualitative research, and quantitative research. It should be noted that in the field of education it often seems that what authors consider qualitative research appears instead to be informed commentary. However, it was decided that how the author treated his material would be the decision rule and not someone else's assessment for this investigation.

There seems to be essentially two types of conceptual frameworks that were represented within the literature. While this may appear to be an over-reduction of literature, the lack of expressed theory in the literature on the process of interracial education simply does not seem to comfortably permit finer distinctions. One of these frameworks is highly critical of the entire institution of public education as it is currently constituted. The second conceptual framework is less critical of the institution as it assumes that problems emerge either from the inadequacies of the participants—administrators, teachers, students, parents—or from technical difficulties in implementation.

It appears that there is a relationship between research methodology and conceptual framework. As one might expect commentary is difficult to associate with one of the two conceptual frameworks. Commentary relies upon other literature, and upon the authors' predilections, to synthesize an argument. Either conceptual framework can be employed.

It appears that quantitative research is more usually associated with the conceptual framework that assumes that school problems are attributable to factors outside the control of the school (i.e., inadequacies of participants) or to technical difficulties (e.g., need for more race relations training for teachers). Qualitative research, conversely, seems overall to be more critical of the institution as it exists within society.

One source of evidence for this conclusion is the pattern of research and framework used in the various issue areas. For example, it seems that for the legal/political literature and the community concerns literature qualitative research was primarily used and the framework is critical of this institution. For the legal/political, it appears that the inconclusiveness of quantitative studies have left judges and researchers alike to rely on more qualitative, historical and legal, assessments. Further, it appears that generally only those researchers that are critical of the institution are significantly concerned with community conflict, factionalism, decision-making, and the role of elites in interracial school processes. Those who are not critical of the institution simply do not seem to ask questions about the community, except in terms of the deficiencies of its inhabitants and/or the technical problems they create for the school.

Similarly, some support for the relationship between research methodology and conceptual framework is found in the literature on school administration. While difficult to be certain, it may well be that many authors became critical of the institution as their research progressed. Many seemed initially concerned with administrators and administrative styles as the problem. Yet they ended up finding the school principal feeling powerless. Their resolution of this finding seems much more critical of the institution of education.

The hypothesis is supported in the reviews of findings of the other issue areas. Taking extraschool factors as an example, quantitative research is more likely to assume individual differences in students to be deficiencies, while qualitative research argues that they are only differences that schools could build upon if the schools were correctly organized and incorporated a different philosophy. This pattern seems consistent to those in the other issue areas.

There seems to be an underlying factor that may account for this pattern. Since there is little in the way of systematic theory about the process of interracial education, it cannot be easily argued that certain types of theory demand certain types of research methodology. However, there does seem to be a relationship between conceptual framework and research methodology that must be attributable to something. The only discernible factor that seems to be consistent with the literature herein reviewed has to do with philosophy of science that guides the endeavor research and explanation. This "third variable" may well be the degree to which the researcher relies upon a positivistic philosophy of science. The more quantitative studies use conceptual frameworks that assume that physiological and/or social forces in large part determine how a person acts, and that these forces are somehow independent of the institution of education. In fact, a usual argument is that the function of school is to deterministically socialize youth into more "acceptable" behavior and mold them for life. The more qualitative studies seem to assume that individuals are acting as freely as possible within the constraints placed upon them by the social institution of education and the specific processes of interracial education.

It would seem to be significant to those who do research, use research findings, or fund research to begin to assess the philosophy of science that is embraced by the researcher. For this may well explain not only the choice of methodology but also the interpretation placed upon the data.

It should be remembered, however, that these findings are tentative, and in need of further exploration. The intent of this literature review was to synthesize a mass, albeit not an exhaustive mass, of literature into a format that hopefully will be useful to a wide range of lay persons, educators, and researchers, while at the same time attempting to tentatively explore and explain any relationship that could be found between conceptual framework and research methodology in the literature reviewed. Hopefully, this has been attained, and will help stimulate future thought and research concerning the processes of interracial education.

REFERENCES

Abney, Everett E.
1974 The Status of Florida's Black School Principals. Journal of Negro Education 43:2-8.

Agee, W. Hugh, and William L. Smith
1974 Modifying Teachers' Attitudes Towards Speakers of Divergent Dialects Through Inservice Training. Journal of Negro Education 43:82-90.

Allen, Van S.
1971 An Analysis of Textbooks Relative to the Treatment of Black Americans. Journal of Negro Education 40:140-145.

Alsworth, Philip L., and Roger R. Woock
1970 Ocean Hill-Brownsville Urban Conflict and the Schools. Urban Education 4:25-40.

Anderson, B. D.
1973 School Bureaucratization and Alienation from High School. Sociology of Education 46:315-334.

Anderson, Margaret
1958 Children of the South. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Arciniega, Thomas A.
1971 Adaptive Mechanisms Employed by Bicultural Students in Urban Secondary Schools. Urban Education 6:233-241.

Armor, David J.
1972 The Evidence of Busing. The Public Interest 28:90-126.

Bagwell, William
1972 School Desegregation in the Carolinas: Two Case Studies. Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press.

Bailey, Stephen K.
1971 Disruption in Urban Public Secondary Schools. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Baratz, Stephen S., And Joan C.
1970 Early Childhood Intervention: The Social Science Base of Institutional Racism. Harvard Educational Review 40:29-50.

Batten, James K.
1970 Politics and Administrative Action. In School Desegregation Retrospect and Prospect. Dr. Eugene C. Lee, Ed. Atlanta: Southern Newspaper Publishers Association Foundation. pp. 42-50.

Bell, Derrick A., Jr.
1975 Waiting on the Promise of *Brown*. Law and Contemporary Problems, Part II (Spring):341-373.

Bell, John A.
1972 Race and School Suspensions in Dallas. Integrated Education 11: 66-67.

Bentley, Robert J.
1971 The Challenge of Pluralism. Journal of Negro Education 40:337-341.

Bereiter, C., and S. Englemann
1966 Teaching Disadvantaged Children in the Pre-School. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Bergen, Jane
1968 Robots in the Classroom: A Look at the American Educational Factory. Wolfe City, Texas: Henington Publishing Co.

Berlowitz, Marvin J.
1974 Institutional Racism and School Staffing in an Urban Area. Journal of Negro Education 43:25-29.

Bernstein, B.
1961 Social Class and Linguistic Development: A Theory of Social Learning. In Education, Economy, and Society. A. H. Halsey, J. Floud, and C. A. Anderson, Eds. New York: Free Press. pp. 288-314.

Beverly, Sherman, Jr.
1975 Comments on "Educational Policy, Community Participation, and Race," A Paper by W. M. Phillips, Jr. Journal of Negro Education 44:268-270.

Bolner, James, and Arnold Vedlitz
1971 The Affinity of Negro Pupils for Segregated Schools: Obstacle to Desegregation. Journal of Negro Education 40:313-321.

Bonacich, Edna, and Robert F. Goodman
1972 Deadlock in School Desegregation: A Case Study of Inglewood, California. New York: Praeger.

Boney, J. Don, Charleta Dunn and Thomas Bass
1971 An Analysis of the Participation of Racially Integrated Guidance Groups of Culturally Different Children in Elementary School. Journal of Negro Education 40:390-393.

Bouma, Donald H., and James Hoffman
1968 The Dynamics of School Integration: Problems and Approaches in a Northern City. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Boykin, Arsene O.
1973 School Facts Support Racial Fears. Urban Education 8:271-276.

Brown, James C., Thomas A. Starnes and J. Allen Watson
1971 Southern Negro and White Educators: A Comparison of Pertinent Characteristics. Journal of Negro Education 40:159-161.

Burbach, Harold J. and Jennings L. Wagoner, Jr.
1974 Dimensions of Powerlessness Among

Black and White High School Students. Journal of Negro Education 43:419-428.

Caliguri, Joseph P., and Daniel U. Levine

1968 A Study of the Use of Inter-Ethnic Materials in Suburban Schools in a Major Metropolitan Area. Phylon 31:220-230.

1971 Teacher Bias in the Selection of Social Studies Textbooks. Journal of Negro Education 40:322-329.

Callahan, Raymond E.

1965 Education and the Cult of Efficiency: A Study of the Social Forces that have Shaped the Administration of the Public Schools. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Carnoy, Martin

1974 Education in Cultural Imperialism. New York: David McKay Co., Inc.

Carter, Donald E., Carol A. Little and Arreed F. Barabasz

1972 Comparative Study of Negro and White Attitudes Associated with Educational-Occupational Aspirations. Journal of Negro Education 41:361-364.

Cataldo, Everett F., Micheal Giles and Douglas S. Gatlin

1975 Metropolitan School Desegregation: Practical Remedy or Impractical Ideal? Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 422:97-104.

Chilman, Katherine

1967 Growing Up Poor. Washington, D.C.: Welfare Administration Publication No. 13, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, U.S. Government Printing Office.

Chisolm, Shirley

1975 Desegregation and National Policy. Integrated Education 13:122-126.

Cicourel, Aaron V., and John I. Kitsuse

1963 The Educational Decision-Makers. New York: Bobbs-Merrill.

Cicourel, Aaron, et al.

1974 Language Use and School Performance. New York: Academic Press.

Clark, Donald H., Arlene Goldsmith and Clementine Pugh

1970 Those Children. Belmont, California: Wordsworth Publishing Co.

Clark, Kenneth B.

1964 Class of Cultures in the Classroom. In Integrated Education—Learning Together. Meyer Weinberg, Ed. Chicago: Integrated Education Association. pp. 18-25.

1965 Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Power. New York: Harper and Row.

1971 Education in the Ghetto: A Human Concern. In Urban Education in the 1970's. A. Harry Passow, Ed. Teachers College, Columbia University: Teachers College Press.

Clarke, Lillian W.

1973 Race and Suspensions in New Orleans. Integrated Education 11:30-33.

Clignet, Remi

1974 Liberty and Equality in the Educational Process. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Coffin, Brenda S., Siegfried C. Dietz and Charles L. Thompson

1971 Academic Achievement in a Poverty High School: Implications for Counseling. Journal of Negro Education 40:365-368.

Cohen, David K.

1968 School Resources and Racial Equality. Education and Urban Society 1:121-137.

Cohen, Ronald D.

1974 Urban Schooling in Twentieth-Century America A Frame of Reference. Urban Education 8:428-437.

Coleman, James S.

1976 Liberty and Equality in School Desegregation. Social Policy 6:9-13.

Coleman, James S., et al.

1966 Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

1975 Coleman, James S., et al. Trends in School Segregation 1968-73 Wash.: The Urban Institute.

Conant, James B.

1961 Slums and Suburbs. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Cottle, Thomas J.

1970 Simple Words, Simple Deeds. Urban Education 5:295-304.

1975 A March on Desegregation. Urban Education 10:115-129.

1975 Out of Work, Out of School. Urban Education 9:400-413.

Crain, Robert L.
1968 The Politics of School Desegregation. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.

Craven, J. Braxton
1970 Through a Looking Glass: The Constitutional Imperative. In School Desegregation. E. C. Lee, Ed. Atlanta: SNPA Foundation Seminar Books.

Crimmins, Timothy J.
1974 The Crystal Stair: Study of the Effects of Caste and Class on Secondary Education in Late-Nineteenth Century Atlanta, Georgia. Urban Education 8:401-420.

Cuban, Larry
1974 Reform by Fiat: The Clark Plan in Washington, 1970-1972. Urban Education 9:8-34.

Dave, Ralph H.
1963 The Identification and Measurement of Environmental Process Variables Related to Educational Achievement. University of Chicago: Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.

Defleur, Lois B., and Ben A. Menke
1975 Learning About the Labor Force: Occupational Knowledge Among High School Males. Sociology of Education 48:324-345.

Dreeben, Robert
1968 On What is Learned in School. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.

Duncan, Otis Dudley
1969 Inheritance of Poverty or Inheritance of Race? *In* On Understanding Poverty: Perspectives from the Social Sciences. Daniel P. Moynihan, Ed. New York: Basic Books. pp. 85-110.

Eddy, Elizabeth M.
1967 Walk the White Line. New York: Praeger.
1975 Educational Innovation and Desegregation: A Case Study of Symbolic Realignment. Human Organization 34:163-172.

Efthim, Helen
1971 Pontiac Desegregation: Myth and Reality. Urban Review 8:2:155-159.

Egerton, John
1973 Promise of Progress: Memphis School Desegregation, 1972-1973. Atlanta: Southern Regional Council.

Entwisle, Doris R., and Murray Webster, Jr.
1974 Expectations in Mixed Racial Groups. Sociology of Education 47: 301-318.

Epps, Edgar G.
1975 Educational Policy-Making: Implications for Urban Schools. Journal of Negro Education 44:309-315.

Eysenck, H. J.
1971 Race, Intelligence and Education. London: Maurice Temple Smith, Ltd.

Falk, William W., and Arthur G. Cosby
1975 The Impact of Desegregation on Rural Students. Integrated Education 14:38-40.

Fantini, Mario D.
1972 Control and Quality Education. In Restructuring American Education. Ray C. Rist, Ed. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books. pp. 46-67.

Finn, Jeremy D., Eugene L. Gaier, Samuel S. Peng and Ronald E. Banks
1975 Teacher Expectations and Pupil Achievement—A Naturalistic Study. Urban Education 10:175-197.

Fish, Kenneth L.
1970 Conflict and Dissent in High Schools. New York: Bruce Publishing Co.

Foster, G. W.
1973 Desegregating Urban Schools. Harvard Educational Review 43:5-36.

Fraser, Elizabeth
1959 Home Environment and the School. London: University of London Press, Ltd.

Freire, Paulo
1973 Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Seabury Press.

Frerichs, Allen H.
1971 Relationship of Self-Esteem of the Disadvantaged to School Success. Journal of Negro Education 40:117-120.

Friedenberg, Edgar Z.
1965 Coming of Age in America. New York: Random House.
1971 The High School as a Focus of "Student Unrest." Annals of Political and Social Science 395:117-127.

Fuchs, Estelle
1966 Pickets at the Gates. New York: The Free Press.

1969 Teachers Talk. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc.

Gentry, Joe E.
1974 Organizational Training for Improving Race Relations in Schools. Education and Urban Society 6:269-284.

Giles, Herman Harry
1959 The Integrated Classroom. New York: Basic Books.

Giles, Micheal W.
1975 Black Concentration and School District Size as Predictors of School Segregation: The Impact of Federal Enforcement. Sociology of Education 48:411-420.

Gillin, John
1955 The School in the Context of the Community. In Introduction to Education: A Comparative Analysis. Donald K. Adams, Ed. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc. pp. 383-392.

Cinzberg, Eli
1960 Segregation and Manpower Waste. Phylon 21:311-316.

Ginsberg, Herbert
1972 The Myth of the Deprived Child. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Gintis, Herb
1971 Education and the Characteristics of Worker Productivity. American Economic Review 61:266-279.

Gittell, Marilyn
1968 Urban School Reform in the 1970's. Education and Urban Society 1:9-19.

Glasser, Ira
1969 The Burden of Blame: A Report on the Ocean Hill-Brownsville School Controversy. Urban Education 4:7-23.

Goldman, Harvey, and Richard Larson
1971 When Inner-City Teachers are Given "Free" Time. Journal of Negro Education 40:4-11.

Goldsborough, Harriett
1971 The Man in the Middle: How the Urban Secondary School Principal Sees His Role and Responsibilities. Canadian Education Association. ED 077 071.

Goodman, Paul
1972 Freedom and Learning: The Need for Choice. In Restructuring American Education. Ray C. Rist, Ed. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books. pp. 137-146.

Goodstein, H. A.
1971 The Use of Structured Curriculum with Black Preschool Dis-Advantaged Children. Journal of Negro Education 40:330-336.

Gordon, Margaret S.
1974 Introduction. In Higher Education and the Labor Market. Margaret S. Gordon, Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill. pp. 1-26.

Gottleib, David
1967 Understanding Children of Poverty. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc.

Grady, Mary L.
1971 An Assessment of Teachers; Attitudes Toward Disadvantaged Children. Journal of Negro Education 40:146-152.

Grauband, Allen
1972 Free the Children. New York: Pantheon.

Greene, John W.
1974 On Rapping with the Inner-City School Dude. Journal of Negro Education 43:310-317.

Greer, Colin
1969 Immigrants, Negroes, and the Public Schools. Urban Review 3:9-12.
1972 The Great School Legend. New York: Basic Books.

Hamilton, Charles V.
1968 Race and Education: A Search for Legitimacy. Harvard Educational Review 38:669-684.

Haney, Craig, and Philip G. Zimbardo
1975 Blackboard Penitentiary-It's Tough to Tell a High School From a Prison. In Psychology Today 9:26-30, 106.

Hanushek, Eric A.
1972 Education and Race: An Analysis of the Educational Production Process. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books.

Harrison, Bennett
1972 Education, Training, and the Urban Ghetto. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Haskins, Jim
1969 Diary of a Harlem Schoolteacher. New York: Grove Press, Inc.

Heber, R.
1969 Milwaukee Sentinel, June 11.

Heller, Robert W.
1969 The Coleman Report Revisited. Urban Education 4:41-54.

Henry, J.
1963 Culture Against Man. New York: Random House, Inc.

Herndon, James
1968 The Way It Spozed to Be. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Hickerson, Nathaniel
1966 Education for Aleination. Englewood Cliffs, New Hersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Hillson, Maurie
1967 The Reorganization of the School: Bringing about a Remission in the Problems Faced by Minority Children. Phylon 28:230-245.

Hines, Carl R.
1970 Implenting Desegregation: Louisville, Kentucky. In School Desegregation Retrospect and Prospect. Dr. Eugene C. Lee, Ed. Atlanta: Southern Newspaper Publishers Association Foundation. pp. 104-120.

Hodgkinson, Harold
1961 Education in Social and Cultural Perspectives. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
1967 Education, Interaction and Social Change. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Holden, Anna
1974 The Bus Stops Here. New York: Agathon Press.

Holt, John Caldwell
1967 How Children Fail. New York: Pitman Publishing Co.
1969 The Under Achieving School. New York: Dell Publishing Co.

Hunt, Maritn H.
1976 Parents-Teachers Alliance: An Alternative to Community Control. Integrateducation 14:35-37.

Husen, Torsten
1972 Social Background and Educational Career. Paris, France: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Illich, Ivan
1972 The Alternative to Schooling. In Restructuring American Education. Ray C. Rist, Ed. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books. pp. 275-277.

Jencks, Christopher, et al.
1972 Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effects of Family and Schooling in America. New York: Basic Books.

Jensen. Arthur R.
1969 How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement? Harvard Educational Review 39:1-123.
1970 Do Schools Cheat Minority Children? Educational Research 14;3-28.

Jones, Leon
1974 Desegregation and Social Reform Since 1954. Journal of Negro Education 43:155-171.

Johnson, Willie
1971 Willie Johnson is Standing Firm. Integrated Education 9:4-11.

Karier, Clarence, Paul Vidas and Joel Spring
1973 Roots of Crisis: American Education in the Twentieth Century. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Katz, Irwin
1964 Review of Evidence Relating to Effects of Desegregation on the Intellectual Performance of Negroes. American Psychologist 19:381-399.

Katz, Micheal
1971 Class, Bureaucracy and Schools. New York: Praeger. 1975 Class, Bureaucracy and Schools, Expanded Edition. New York: Praeger.

Kearney, Annette G., and Robert L. Clayton
1973 Career Opportunity for Blacks: Trick or Treat? School Counselor 21:102-108.

Keddie, Nell (ed.)
1973 The Myth of Cultural Deprivation. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, Inc.

Kirp, David L.
1968 The Poor, the Schools, and Equal Protection. Harvard Educational Review 38:635-684.

Koch, E. L.
1975 School Vandalism and Strategies of

Social Control. Urban Education 10:54-71.

Kvaraceus, William C.
1971 Fantasies in a Place Called "School." In Reactions to Silberman's Crisis in the Classroom. A. Harry Passow, Ed. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Co. pp. 66-77.

Labov, William
1970 The Logic of Non-Standard English. In The Myth of Cultural Deprivation. Nell Keddie, Ed. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books. pp. 21-67.

La Porte, Robert, Jr , Jerome Becker and Charles V. Willie
1965 The Evolution of Public Educational Policy: School Desegregation in a Northern City. Urban Education 2:150-162.

Larkin, Ralph W.
1975 Social Exchange in the Elementary School Classroom: The Problem of Teacher Legitimation of Social Power. Sociology of Education 48: 400-410.

Leacock, Eleanor Burke
1969 Teaching and Learning in City Schools: A Comparative Study. New York: Basic Books.

Leesinger, Leon M.
1971 Educational Engineering: Managing Change to Secure Stipulated Results for Disadvantaged Children. Journal of Negro Education 40: 277-281.

Levenson, William B.
1968 The Spiral Pendulum. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Levine, Daniel U.
1972 Concepts of Bureaucracy in Urban School Reform. In Urban Education, (Revised Edition). Richard R. Heidenreich, Ed. Arlington, Virginia: College Readings, Inc. pp. 335-343.
1972 Stratification, Segregation, and Children in the Inner-City School. Richard R. Heidenreich, Ed. Arlington, Virginia: College Readings, Inc. pp. 237-245.

Levy, Gerald E.
1970 Ghetto School. New York: Pegasus Western Publishing Co.

Libarle, Marc, and Tom Seligson (Eds.)
1970 The High School Revolutionaries. New York: Random House.

Lincoln, C. Eric
1960 Anxiety, Fear, and Integration. Phylon 21:278-285.

Lundberg, George A.
1939 Foundations of Sociology. New York: The MacMillan Co.

Mackler, Bernard
1969 The Theatre of the Absurd: The New York City Public Schools. Urban Education 4:310-332.

Marascuilo, Leonard A., and F. Dagenais
1974 The Meaning of the Word "Integration" in a Multi-Racial High School. Journal of Negro Education 43:178-189.

McCormick, Marijo K., and Juanita H. Williams
1974 Effects of a Compensatory Program on Self-Report, Achievement and Aspiration Level of "Disadvantaged" High School Students. Journal of Negro Education 43:47-52.

McCullough, Tom
1974 Urban Education, "It's No Big Thing." Urban Education 9:117-135.

McLaurin, Melton
1971 Images of Negroes in Deep South Public School State History Texts. Phylon 32:237-246.

Meranto, Philip
1969 School Desegregation: Urban and Suburban. Education and Urban Society 1:231-235.

Montague, Ashley (Ed.)
1970 Race and IQ. New York: Oxford University Press.

Moore, G. Alexander, Jr.
1964 Realities of the Urban Classroom: Observations in Elementary Schools. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc.

Moynihan, Daniel P.
1968 Sources of Resistance to the Coleman Report. Harvard Educational Review 38:23-36.

Nelson, William C.

1972 The Storefront School: A Vehicle for Change. In Restructuring American Education. Ray C. Rist, Ed. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books. pp. 223-235.

Newby, Robert G., and David B. Tyack

1971 Victims Without "Crimes": Some Historical Perspectives on Black Education. Journal of Negro Education 40:192-206.

Noar, Gertrude

1966 The Teacher and Integration. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Oberle, Wayne H.

1974 Role Models of Black and White Rural Youth at Two Stages of Adolescence. Journal of Negro Education 43:233-244.

Ogbu, John U.

1974 The Next Generation. New York: Academic Press.

Orfield, Gary

1969 The Reconstruction of Southern Education. New York: Wiley-Interscience.

1975 Examining the Desegregation Process. Integrated Education 13:127-130.

1976 Untitled. Social Policy 6:24-31.

Orstein, Allan C.

1971 The Need for Research on Teaching the Disadvantaged. Journal of Negro Education 40:133-139.

Pallone, Nathaniel J., Robert B. Hurley and Fred S. Richard

1973 Black Students and School Counselors: Rhetoric and Reality. School Counselor 20:259-279.

Pearl, Arthur

1972 The Atrocity of Education. St. Louis: New Critics Press.

Perley, Martin M.

1975 The Louisville Story. Integrateducation 78:11-14.

Perry, George A.

1973 A Better Chance: Evaluation of Student Attitudes and Academic Performance, 1964-1972. Boston, Massachusetts: A Better Chance.

Peterson, John H., Jr.

1975 Black-White Joking Relationships Among Newly Integrated Faculty. Integrated Education 13:33-37.

Petroni, Frank A. Ernest A. Hirsch and C. Lillian Petroni

1970 Two, Four, Six, Eight, When You Gonna Integrate? New York: Behavioral Publications.

Pettigrew, Ann Hallman, and Thomas F. Pettigrew

1963 Race, Disease and Desegregation: A New Look. Phylon 24:315-333.

Pettigrew, Thomas

1968 School Integration in Current Perspective. Urban Review 3:4-8.

1975 Racial Discrimination in the United States. New York: Harper and Row.

1975 The Cold Structural Inducements to Integration. Urban Review 8:137-144.

Pettigrew, Thomas et al.

1973 Busing: A Review of the Evidence. The Public Interest 30:88-118.

Phillips, W. M., Jr.

1975 Educational Policy, Community Participation, and Race. Journal of Negro Education 44:256-267.

Preston, James D., and Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.

1974 On Modification of Interracial Interaction. American Sociological Review 39:283-285.

Prichard, Paul N.

1969 Effects of Desegregation on Student Success in the Chapel Hill City School. Integrated Education 7:33-37.

Rafky, David M.

1972 Blue-Collar Power: The Social Impact of Urban School Custodians. Urban Education 6:349-371, 7:5-32.

Ravitch, Diane

1976 Integration, Segregation, Pluralism. American Scholar 45:206-217.

Read, Frank T.

1975 Judicial Evolution of the Law of School Integration Since *Brown* v. *Board of Education*. Law and Contemporary Problems, Part I (Winter):7-49.

Redl, Fritz

1975 Disruptive Behavior in the Classroom. School Review 83:569-594.

Reimer, Everett W.
1970 School is Dead: Alternatives in Education. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc.

Richardson, Ken, David Spears and Martin Richards (Eds.)
1972 Race and Intelligence. Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books.

Richer, Stephen
1974 Middle-Class Bias—Fact or Fancy? Sociology of Education 47:523-534.

Rist, Ray C.
1970 Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations: The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education. Harvard Educational Review 40:416-451.
1972 Restructuring American Education: Innovations and Alternatives. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books.
1972 The Milieu of a Ghetto School as a Precipitator of Educational Failure. Phylon 33:348-360.
1973 The Urban School: Factory for Failure. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
1974 Busing White Children into Black Schools: A Study in Controversy. Integrated Education 12:13-18.
1974 Race Policy in Schooling. Trans-Action/Society 12:59-64.
1976 School Integration and Minority Student Tokenism. Integrated Education 14:18-20.

Rosenbaum, James E.
1975 The Stratification of Socialization Process. American Sociological Review 40:48-54.

Rosenberg, Morris, and Roberta G. Simmons
1971 Black and White Self-Esteem: The Urban School Child. Arnold M. and Caroline Rose Monograph Series, American Sociological Association, Washington, D.C.

Rosenthal, Robert, and Lenore Jacobson
1968 Pygmalion in the Classroom. New York: Holt, Rhinehart, and Winston.

Rossell, Christine H.
1975a School Desegregation and White Flight. Political Science Quarterly 90:675-695.
1975b White Flight. Integrateducation. November-December, No. 78.

Rubin, Samuel S., and Alice Pisciotto
1974 Racial Interaction in School and Society. New York: Vantage Press.

Ryan, William
1965 Racial Imbalance, Cultural Deprivation, and Reading Achievement. Mimeograph (Advisory Committee on Racial Imbalance and Education, background paper, No. 7): Massachusetts State Board of Education.

St. John, Nancy
1975 School Desegregation: Outcomes for Children. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

St. John, Nancy H., and Ralph G. Lewis
1975 Race and the Social Structure of the Elementary Classroom. Sociology of Education 48:346-368.

Saunders, Robert J., and Ronald L. Coccari
1973 Racial Earnings Differentials: Some Economic Factors. The American Journal of Economics and Sociology 32:225-233.

Schafer, Walter E., and Carol Olexa
1971 Tracking and Opportunity: The Locking-Out Process and Beyond. Scranton: Chandler Publishing Company.

Schrag, Peter
1967 Village School Downtown: Politics and Education—A Boston Report. Boston: Beacon Press.

Schreck, Robert, Lubbie Harper, Jr. and Norman N. Goroff
1975 Metamorphosis of Lee High School. Urban Education 10:198-211.

Sexton, Patricia
1968 City Schools, Inequality and Modified Class Struggle. In Readings on the School in Society. Patricia Sexton, Ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc. pp. 131-137.

Silberman, Charles
1970 Crisis in the Classroom. New York: Random House.

Silverman, Irvin, and Marvin E. Shaw
1973 Effects of Sudden Mass School Desegregation on Interracial Interaction and Attitudes in One Southern City. Journal of Social Issues 29:133-142.

Singleton, Robert

1975 The Black Child and Equity in School Finance: Analysis and Alternatives. Journal of Negro Education 44:271-207.

Smith, Charles V.

1975 Public School Desegregation and the Law. Social Forces 54:317-327.

Smith, Paul M., Jr.

1971 The Role of the Guidance Counselor in the Desegregation Process. Journal of Negro Education 40:347-351.

Solomon, Victor

1970 An Alternative to Segregation: A Proposal for Community School Districts. In School Desegregation Retrospect and Prospect. Dr. Eugene C. Lee, Ed. Atlanta: Southern Newspaper Publishers Association Foundation. pp. 133-147.

Stein, Anne

1971 Strategies for Failure. Harvard Educational Review 41:158-204.

Stewart, Charles E.

1965 Racial Issues Confronting Large City School Administrators. Urban Education 1:202-214.

Stinchcombe, Arthur L., Mary McDill and Dollie Walker

1969 Is There a Racial Tipping Point in Changing Schools? Journal of Social Issues 25:127-136.

Stones, Micheal E.

1971 School Administrator Attitudes and Racism. Integrated Education 9:54-59.

Strauss, George H.

1974 School as Power Structure, Student Attitudes Toward High School Policies, Student Power Position, and Student Rights Movement. Education and Urban Society 7:3-27.

Sullivan, Allen R.

1972 The influence of Social Processes on the Learning Abilities of Afro-American School Children: Some Educational Implications. Journal of Negro Education 41:127-136.

Swanson, Bert

1969 Psycho-Political Patterns of School Desegregation: Mount Vernon, New York. Education and Urban Society 1:193-230.

Taylor, William L., John E. Benjes and Eric E. Wright

1976 School Desegregation and the Courts. Social Policy 6:32-35.

Teele, James E., and Clara Mayo

1969 School Racial Integration: Tumult and Shame. Journal of Social Issues 25:137-156.

Thelen, Herbert A.

1954 Dynamics of Groups at Work. Chicagp: University of Chicago Press.

Tobier, Arthur

1975 School Integration: An Ongoing Theme. Urban Review 8:134-136.

Tucker, Sterling

1971 Black Strategies for Change in America. Journal of Negro Education 40:297-311.

Turbowitz, Stanley

1971 Confessions of a Ghetto Administrator. *In* Crisis in Urban Schools. Thomas E. Glass, Ed. New York: MSS Information Corp. pp. 215-223.

Tyack, David B.

1974 The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Valentine, Charles

1968 Culture and Poverty. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Venn, Grant

1964 Man, Education and Work. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Watts, Walter Normon

1973 Liberation and Freedom in an Urban Learning Community: A Rationale for a Comprehensive Education Model for Afro-Americans. New York: MSS Information Corp.

Weinberg, Meyer

1970 The Education of the Minority Child. Chicago: Integrated Education Associates.

1971 Schooling and the New Parenthood. Journal of Negro Education 40:207-215.

1975 The Relationship Between School Desegregation and Academic Achievement: A Review of the Research. Law and Contemporary Problems 35:241-270.

Wiles, David K.

1970 The Mosaic Composition of Urban School Teachers. Urban Education 5:141-150.

Willerman, Marvin

1975 Interruption Behavior in the Elementary School Classroom. Illinois School Research 11:19-27.

Wilson, A. B.

1968 Social Class and Equal Educational Opportunity. Harvard Educational Review 38:77-84.

Winecoff, Larry H., and Eugene W. Kelly, Jr.

1971 Problems in School Desegregation: Real or Imaginary? Integrated Education 9:3-10.

Wittmer, Joe

1971 Effective Counseling of Children of Several American Subcultures. The School Counselor 19:49-5[illegible].

Wolf, Ronald M.

1964 The Identification and Measurement of Environmental Process Variables Related to General Intelligence. University of Chicago: Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.

Woodard, Samuel L.

1965 Belief Congruence Theory and School Integration. Urban Education 2:169-173.

Woodworth, William [illegible] and Richard T. Salzer

1971 Black Children's Speech and Teachers' Evaluations. Urban Education 6:167-172.

Yudof, Marg G.

1975 Suspension and Expulsion of Black Students from the Public School: Academic Capital Punishment and the Consitution. In Law and Contemporary Problems 39:374-411.

Ziegler, Harmon, and Micheal Boss

1974 Racial Problems and Policy in the American Public Schools. Sociology of Education 47:319-336.

RESEARCH ON DESEGREGATION IN SCHOOL AND CLASSROOM SETTINGS An Annotated Bibliography from a Field Methods Perspective

Rodney Riffel
Francis A. J. Ianni
Margaret Orr
Elizabeth Reuss-Ianni
Audrey Savwoir
Andrea Sparks
The Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute
Teachers College
Columbia University
New York

PREFACE

The development of an incisive literature review on desegregation is not an easy task. An Educational Research Information Center (ERIC) review has produced over 2,516 studies in just the past ten years that focus on some aspect of the desegregation/integration issue. To make this point further, in 1966 the Center for Urban Education published Meyer Weinberg's desegregation bibliography of 3,100 references (Weinberg:1966). In 1970 Weinberg published another bibliography, this time on the education of the minority child, containing over 10,000 references (Weinberg:1970). Considering the passage of just six years, one hesitates to cite still another comprehensive list of writings on desegregation.

Our task in the compilation of this bibliography was to look at the literature on interracial processes in schools, especially those items that use or impinge upon conceptual models and analyses which have involved direct classroom observations in their formulation. So much of the literature to date deals with the assessment of quantitative outcomes and has ignored the qualitative processes operating in the school. While we discussed the former approach our focus was on the latter style. Hence, attempt was made to focus on the observational life and schools in an attempt to get at the patterns and dynamics of socialization in desegregated settings.

We have found some advice on how to proceed from Cohen and Garet's discussion of informing education policy with applied social research:

> Applied research resembles a discourse about social reality—a debate about social problems and their solutions. Like intelligent discussion or debate, applied research does not necessarily reduce disagreement. Instead it calls attention to the existence of conflicting positions, sometimes elaborates them, and sometimes generates new issues altogether. Like discourse, it often has a loose and unstable connection with other sorts of social action. (1975:42)

This notion of discourse is not unlike field research itself for it requires that one first develop a certain analytic awareness to the social reality under study. In that sense, we have approached the literature on desegregation in much the fashion of participant observers, looking for consensus and conflict among the results of other research. We have sequentially sampled the literature not just in classroom observation but in related areas such as field studies in schools and communities. From this search we developed a working hypotheses. We are convinced that we have been able to uncover a few gaps in existing bibliographies on desegregation that will prove to be significant for anyone interested in this area.

A field methods perspective also requires a holistic approach for viewing the issue of desegregation. This means that to understand classroom processes we not only had to review the research on desegregation, but also, in the manner of contextual analysis, what people have said about this research. Implicit here is a discussion of what the courts were saying for they are the context that provided the incentive for desegregation research in the first place.

Toward this end we set a number of social scientists and educators interested in diverse aspects of the area of desegregation and policy formation to the task of searching out the research literature regularly and compared our findings. This monograph represents a reformulation of the papers this group produced. Five categories are presented: a socio-legal history of desegregation in America, a review of the literature on desegregation and classroom effects, a conceptual critique of the implications of acculturation and ethnicity for the study of desegregation, and finally an exploration of classroom observation techniques for the study of desegregated classroom.

While the text argues that these areas are interrelated, the monograph has been separated into five areas in an attempt to aid the reader's understanding of what we're trying to say. Thus, it seemed only logical that the relevant annotations should follow each section.

References Cited

Cohen, David K. and Michael S. Garet

1975 Reforming Educational Policy with Applied Social Research. Harvard Educational Review 45, 1:17-43.

In a discussion of the policy implications of applied research the authors propose a discourse between the two. They suggest that premises regarding the relationship between these two areas currently in use are faulty and traditional practices may not be satisfactory.

Weinberg, Meyer, Ed.

1966 School Integration. New York: Center for Urban Education.

A bibliography of over 3,000 references dealing with the issue of school integration according to topical categories.

1970 The Education of the Minority Child. Chicago: Integrated Education Associates.

This bibliography contains over 10,000 entries dealing with the education of minority children. The author defines education as "schooling within the framework of social, legal, economic, and political factors that help shape that experience." Documents are organized according to twenty-three topics.

THE SOCIO-LEGAL HISTORY OF DESEGREGATION IN AMERICA

Overview

One indication of the growing social interest in educational issues is the frequency with which such issues are being referred to and decided by the courts rather than by the schools themselves. This growth of social concern and the persistence of a number of legal issues as national concerns have produced a socio-legal background against which research questions and results in the field of desegregation must be examined. Consequently, any literature review on desegregation should begin with this perspective.

It should be noted that five eras of social revolution divide litigation evolvements following the Brown decision after the 1953 concept of "freedom of choice" (Bolmeier 1970). These eras were ushered in by four separate cases from Kansas, South Carolina, Virginia, and Delaware which were consolidated for Brown I. Each plantiff black child sought admission to public schools of its community on a nonsegregated basis. In each state, except Delaware, these requests were refused on the "separate but equal" doctrine of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* (1896). The Court found that equal protection of the laws was denied by that doctrine and that segregation was damaging to black children.

Period I, 1954-1956, was a period of waiting in which the second Brown decision was rendered in May 1955. It emphasized that the Constitution does not require integration; it merely forbids discrimination.

Period II, 1956-1960, represented a period of resistance wherein people through their legislatures sought to circumvent the decree in Brown II. These laws were, in many respects, in violation of the XIVth Amendment.

During *Period III*, roughly 1960-1971, Civil Rights was at its zenith. The early 1960s was a time of token compliance with desegregation laws. In 1964 the Civil Rights Act was enacted which shifted the desegregation story from the courtrooms of the nation to the U. S. Office of Education. That office places pupils on a nonracial basis. Guidelines of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department of 1965 and 1966 provided school administrators with necessary directions for accomplishing nonracial unitary school. Three plans were as follows: (1) geographical districts,[1] (2) freedom of choice,[2] and (3) combinations of both of these.[3]

Period IV, 1968-1972, saw judicial revotation in the deep South. Federal courts mandated massive integration.

Period V, 1972-1976 approximately, is the current scene wherein school administrators and courts to a limited extent favor "freedom of choice." Also, from *Swann* V. *Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education* 402 U.S. 767-8, 769, 722, confusion over the future of integration existed. Moving integration from the South to ghettos and barrios of the East and West has been attempted. Litigation over second generation problems is occurring.

The Decision-Making Process

Essentially, the legal history of desegregation in the United States is the history of post Civil War attempts to establish and enforce the Emancipation Proclamation of 1889. It encompasses the Constitution as well for it was the XIIIth Amendment which abolished slavery in 1865 and the XIVth Amendment of 1866 which proclaimed all persons born or naturalized in the United States to be citizens protected against deprivation of life, liberty and property without due process and guaranteeing them equal protection of the law. Prior to the Civil War, the popular opinion that slaves were not entitled to equal protection before the law was also the legal opinion. Indeed, the first case involving adjudication of civil rights of freed slaves—*Dred Scott* v. *Sanford*, 19 Howard 393 (1857)—decided that the freed slave had no rights.

After the Emancipation Proclamation, the development of segregated institutions became a matter of social and legal process at the state level. A number of states enacted statutes enforcing separation of the races in education, public transportation, dining, employment, housing, jury duty and voting. Even where such statutes did not exist, every phase of American social life was segregated whenever and wherever blacks and whites impinged on one another.

Within this context, the history of educational desegregation has proceeded from a number of important legal opinions and acts. As early as 1855, the State of Massachusetts abolished segregated schools but it was almost one hundred years later that concerted legal action toward desegregation really began. When the Supreme Court outlawed enforced segregation in housing in *Buchanan* v. *Warley* in 1917, and eradicated restrictive convenants in housing in *Shelley* v. *Kraemer* in 1948, the way was paved for an outright attack on the legality of segregation which had been established in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* in 1896 which upheld racially segregated schools in the dual system pattern.

First, *Briggs* v. *Elliott*, 98 F. Supp. 529 (1951) exposed unequal facilities of segregated schools. Then, *Brown* v. *Board of Education of Topeka Kansas* (Brown I), 98 F. Supp. 797 (1951) held that "in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities were declared inherently unequal. This holding was implemented the following year in *Brown* v. *Board of Education* 349U.S. 294. (Brown II), where the court ordered the termination of dual school systems "with all deliberate speed." More than a decade later, with many of the nation's public schools as segregated as ever, an impatient Supreme Court shifted the standard: "The burden on a school board today is to come forward with a plan that promises realistically to work, and promises realistically to work now." In 1969, the court announced that "the obligation of every school district is to terminate dual school systems at once" (Frank and Nitsche 1974/1975).

Brown II entails the Supreme Court's delineation of the extent to which lower federal courts could exercise their equitable powers to order desegregation, when local school boards had failed to meet their constitutional responsibilities. District school boards retained primary responsibility for achieving desegregation, but the federal courts could utilize broad powers to insure that local boards complied with minimum constitutional requirements. *Green* v. *County School Board*, 391 U.S. 430, for example, was the rejection by the court of a proposed plan allowing parents "freedom of choice" as to the school their children would attend.

It was in *Swann* v. *Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education* 402 U.S. 1 (1971), that the Supreme Court sanctioned the use of a broad arsenal of school desegregation remedies, sustaining the plan devised by a district court-appointed expert following the court's rejection of the local school board's desegregation plans. The remedies included altering teacher and pupil assignments and overseeing the location of new schools. At times, the Supreme Court permits gerrymandering of school districts and attendance zones. There are, however, limits upon the power of federal courts to initiate desegregation programs.

In *Milliken* v. *Bradley*, 484 F.2d 215, 244 (1973), for example, because of the high percentage of blacks in Detroit schools, a single-district remedy would make the entire school system identifiably black. To avoid this result, as well as the possible acceleration of a white exodus to the suburbs, the district court concluded that it was necessary to go beyond school district boundaries in order to effect a significant remedy to the constitutional violation. This concern has also been extended to include the financing of education. In still another decision, *The San Antonio Independent School District* v. *Rodriguez* in 1973, it was declared that discriminatory state aid programs were illegal.

Indeed, if the courts at all believed in a perceived equality through the Brown decisions, something less was happening in terms of outcomes. Policy difficult in mandating is often harder to enact. Societal reaction represented nothing more than an "institutionalized evasion of institutional rules" (Merton and Nisbet 1966:730). This subtle but effective evasion of compliance to the spirit of Brown I and II in turn mandated a new series of court decisions. The problem is illustrated by the fact that new decrees were required to deal with such seemingly diverse areas, as busing, school staffing, and even bilingual education.

Moreover, the jurisprudence of busing reveals the uncertainty which characterizes many of the desegregation decrees. How harmful is the challenged practiced? It is sufficiently harmful to justify remedial costs? These questions are still at the base of the continuing controversy over busing. The Rodriguez Case (1973), for example, upheld a desegregation plan that included grouping suburban and inner-city schools and transporting students accordingly. Yet, the *Davis* v. *East Baton Rouge Parish School Board*, 393 F. Supp. 1013, cites a refusal by the court to order massive busing for the sole purpose of achieving a greater percentage of racial mixing in each school. The rationale was that the East Baton Rouge Parish school system had been desegregated and was a unitary system. Therefore a new plan of desegregation was not justified.

The courts have also declared that if overcrowding was a problem, then inner-city school children could be transported outside the city. In *Higgins* v. *Board of Education of City of Grand Rapids, Michigan*, 395 F. Supp. 444 affd. 508 F.2d. 799, the decision was made that despite a 75% cost reimbursement by the State to the rural school system, no reimbursement was necessary to the Grand Rapids school system. Such a practice was said to not be related to racial difference or segregative intent.

Assignment or admission to particular schools also became a problem considered by the courts. In *U.S.* v. *Hirds County School Board*, 516 F.2d 974, it was decided that a school district could be required to modify its assignment system. Zone lines equidistant between the black school and other schools, which were being attended by white students residing in the area of the black school, were established to implement strict neighborhood assignments at schools attended only by black students being attended by white students residing in the area of the black school were established to implement strict neighborhood assignment at schools attended only by black students.

Furthermore, merely assigning students was not a bona fide effort to comply with requirements for desegregation. In *Tasby* v. *Estes*, 517 F.2d 92, a dual education system, it was not satisfactory that the district's objective was limited to only redirecting a racial group's composition of the student population in each particular school

And, in *Bd. of Ed. of City School Dist. of City of Cincinnati* v. *Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Region 5*, 396 F. Supp. 203, the Provisio of Emergency School Aid Act was upheld. This act stated that no provision thereof shall be construed to require assignment of students or teachers to overcome racial imbalance and does not operate as a ban or prohibition on the reassignment of students and teachers to achieve racial balance.

But, closing existing schools and reopening new ones necessitates moving professional personnel. True desegregation of a school requires that faculties as well as the student body must be desegregated.

The XIVth Amendment forbids selection and assignment of teachers on the basis of race. In *North Carolina Teachers Association* v. *Asheboro City Board of Education*, Canc. 1968, 393 F.2d 736, it was decided that denial of due process has occurred when black teachers lost their jobs "teaching Negro pupils" upon elimination of all-black Junior and Senior High programs. Black teachers not reassigned in desegregating were similarly denied due process (*Rolfe* v. *County Board of Education of Lincoln City Tennessee*, c. a. Tenn. 1968, 391 F.2d 77). And, in *Chambers* v. *Hendersonville City Board of Education*, Canc. 1966, 364 F.2d 189, it was decreed that due process required that objective standards for the employment and retention of teachers applied equally to all teachers. Yet, in *Guy* v. *Wheeler, D.C. Texas*, 1973, 363 F. Supp. 764, it was shown that achieving the lowest rating in an interracial group tested was reasonable grounds not to rehire a black teacher. Furthermore, in *Johnson* v. *San Francisco Unified School District*, D. C. Cal., 1971, 339 F. Supp. 1315, school authorities violated the XIVth Amendment by assigning black teachers and teachers of limited experience to "black" schools and hardly any to "white" schools. And, once it is established that black teachers are disproportionately assigned to black schools, the responsible school authority may fairly be required to demonstrate that such assignments were not racially motivated. In *Bd. of Ed. of Ohio School Dist. of City of Cincinnati* v. *Dept. of Health, Ed. and Welfare Region 5*, 396 F. Supp. 203, it was decreed that students and faculty may be reassigned to achieve racial balance, but no provision of the Emergency School Aid Act was to be construed to require assignment of students or teachers to overcome racial imbalance.

The complex nature of the court's decision-making process is further indicated in the fact that through the XIVth Amendment, the Constitution does not require education geared to the unique developmental and cultural needs of minorities. Bilingual education, while in many ways related to desegregation, is not, in the legal sense, a substitute for desegregation. The Constitution does not require education geared to unique developmental and cultural needs of minorities (XIVth Amendment). If consolidation of schools is not necessary to relive a constitutional violation or to remove obstacles to such relief, the District Court lacked power to order consolidation.

In New York City, a proposal that all Spanish-surnamed children should receive the Spanish test, rather than giving the test only to those scoring below a particular percentile on the English version was rejected (*Aspira of New York, Inc.* v. *Board of Education of City of New York* 394 F. Sup. 1161).

Where English language deficiency is the cause of lower achievement among Spanish-surnamed and Indian students, this was seen in violation of the XIVth Amendment and Equal Protection Clause of Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. In *Serna* v. *Portales Municipal Schools* 499 F.2d 114, a denial of equal educational opportunity existed under color of state law. In failing to provide bi-lingual and bi-cultural education for needs of Mexican-American children, a minority group was deprived of high quality education.

It is important to remember, however, that although language can be an indication of race and even though exclusion on a language base may in reality be racial denial, it is the exclusion on racial grounds which offends the Constitution—not the particular skin color or language of the person excluded.[3]

Implications for Research

The courts' mandated change and the study of change has always been a favored topic of the research enterprise. Busing and desegregation had, among other things, implications for demographic research. Desegregation of school staff relates to organizational studies. Bilingual education means many things including classroom processes and culture contact. In short, there are many units of analysis. If anything, researchers can add to the confusion over policy formation. As Henry Levin advises:

> Social science research can best be used to frame the issues and their consequences rather than to obtain conclusive evidence on what is right and what is to be done. This approach requires a recognition that while many aspects of the world cannot be quantified or analyzed in a social science setting, such factors should be considered along with the results of social science research. It is not clear that utilization of social science research in this manner is consistent with an adversary framework. Further, if social science findings increasingly are used to create what appear to be technical issues out of essentially moral dilemmas, this presents a potential social danger. The apparently increasing reliance of the courts on social science evidence suggests that intensive debate on these issues should be given high priority. (1975:240)

As the legal history shows, the institution of change through court mandate is not an easy task. Decisions produced unexpected results. It is thus necessary to understand this process of decision making for as new decisions on the desegregation issue emerge, unanticipated consequences are created for the entire social order. The research on school desegregation has closely followed these unanticipated consequences, but as Levin observes, not without introducing its own forms of bias.

Notes

[1] *Milliken* v. *Govenor of Michigan et al.* v. *Bradley et al.*, Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the 6th Circuit, July 25, 1974.

[2] *Wheeler* v. *Durham County Board of Education*, 5 21 Fed. 1136.

[3] *Morgan* v. *Kerrigan, Massachusetts*, 401 F. Supp. 216.

References Cited

Bolmeier, E. C.
1970 Legal Issues in Education. Charlottesville, Va.: Michie Co.
Discussion of litigation evolvements following the Brown decision with conclusions about the united effort of all three branches of the Federal Government to end racial discrimination in the public schools.

Frank, Edward D. and Marc Nitsche
1974/75 Civil Rights. *In* Annual Survey of American Law, Vol. 37. New York: New York University School of Law.
A discussion of Civil Rights and the impact of the judicial system.

Levin, Henry M.
1975 Education, Life Chances and the Courts: The Role of Social Science Evidence. Law and Contemporary Problems, Part II 39, 2:217-239.
Levin argues the need for recognition of the biases inherent in social science research, especially among those in decision making capacity (i.e. judges). He states that social science research is best used to frame issues rather than be used as exclusive evidence.

Merton, Robert K.
1961 Social Problems and Sociological Theory. *In* Contemporary Social Problems. Robert Merton and Robert Nisbet, Eds. New York: Harcourt Brace & World, Inc., pp. 697-737.
A discussion of theoretical underpinning of contemporary social problems.

Additional Readings

Bark, Robert H.
1972 Constitutionality of President's Busing

Proposals, Vol. 17.58. New York Bar Bound Periodicals.

Contains Nixon's two bills on court-ordered busing. These were (1) "Student Transportation Moratorium Act of 1972" which froze the present plan giving Congress time for long-range solutions, (2) "Equal Education Opportunities Act of 1972" which goes beyond the XIVth Amendment. Analysis is confined to the constitutionality of the proposed legislation. Title IV refers to busing and other remedies.

Blaustein, Albert

1958 Some Propositions and Research. Desegregation. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith.

Suggestions by Suchman, Edward Dean, John P. Williams et al., Cornell concerning social stratification, social mobility, occupational achievement, education, style of life, also characteristically black "life styles." Desegregation is viewed as a power problem. Kinds of power are mentioned and the operation of this power system is explained.

Blaustein, Albert and Clarence Clyde Ferguson

1962 Desegregation and the Law, 2d ed. rev. New York: Vintage Books.

Court history of specific cases as applied to the Constitution. All significant school segregation cases are reported.

Bolmeier, E. C.

1973 Landmark Supreme Court Decisions on Public School Issues. Charlottesville, Va.: Michie Co.

Discussed Brown vs. Board of Education (Kansas) 347 U.S. 483, 74 S. Ct. 686 (1954). The issue discussed was whether segregation of white and black children in the public schools of a State solely on the basis of race, pursuant to state laws permitting or requiring such segregation, denies to black children the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the XIVth Amendment—even though the physical facilities and other 'tangible' factors of white and black schools may be equal.

It was held that segregation of white and black children in the public schools, solely on the basis of race, denied black children equal protection of laws guaranteed by the XIVth Amendment, and was therefore unconstitutional.

Coles, Robert

1963 The Desegregation of Southern Schools. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith.

This is a study of 9 black children selected by the Atlanta Board of Education for initial desegregation in 1961. Weekly follow-up in psychiatric interviews was conducted. Parents were seen and interviews held at home during the entire school year. Twelve white children in four high schools in Atlanta were chosen for similar study.

Kluger, Richard

1976 Simple Justice. New York: Alfred Knopf.

This book is a documented history of Brown v. Board of Education, the epochal Supreme Court decision that outlawed segregation, and of black America's century-long struggle for equality under law. It has minute details of the lives and works of important black leaders who helped the NAACP accomplish its task of exposing the system and changing the laws. Among these are Thurgood Marshall, Kenneth Clark (doll experiments: black dolls vs. white dolls), Robert Carter, Counsel for NAACP, et al. There is an excellent index of principal cases cited as well as subject and name indices.

Ziegler, Benjamin Munn

1958 Desegregation and the Supreme Court. Boston: Heath & Co.

This entails the entire scope of the Constitution. It states rules of law and ethical considerations motivating decision of the judges.

THE EFFECTS OF DESEGREGATION IN THE CLASSROOM

As we have just seen, the Brown decision of 1954 was an attempt to shape social-behavioral change in the educational experience of Americans. Since that historic decision, researchers have tried, in many ways, to measure the extent of change, both anticipated and unanticipated, as a consequence of this decision. Many factors which confound such a change process and were not apparent when the decision was made, are only now coming to light.

Problems have emerged in even the simplest or most straightforward research analysis of desegregated schools. Not all the effects of desegregation are measurable, nor are they necessarily mutually exclusive of other influencing factors. Thus attempts to interpret data often lead to fuzzy rather than clear conclusions.

The literature review of the effects of desegregation on the students, both black and white, has brought to light some interesting problems, as it explores the research done. Underlying the complexity of the situation, there seems to be an overall confusion as to what the purpose of the desegregation decision was and what ends it was supposed to achieve for minority groups. Was it to end racism? Provide equal opportunity for children? Raise test scores? Often it appeared that either the research was either not asking the right questions or it was addressed to questions which were not researchable. As a result, neither the success of desegregation nor the quality of the research in this area can be conclusively evaluated.

What Type of Research Has Been Done

In researching the consequences of desegregation on students the literature seems to fall into five categories: (a) that dealing with changes in achievement test scores, (b) that dealing with the psychological factors of self-esteem, anxiety and control of the environment, (c) that having to do with social interaction, either in peer group or student-teacher, (d) and those studies which take a case study approach to examining schools or districts in their attempts to desegregate. A final category must serve to include those articles that have tried to analyze the pros and cons of desegregation, either generally or theoretically, as related to students, such as policy questions, issues related to busing problems, or analysis of the emergence of white flight and its origin. As this latter category is quite large, it necessarily has been limited to only those articles which directly spoke to the implications for students in public schools.

In the first few years after *Brown*, many of the studies were basically concerned with one or two variables in researching desegregation, as if the schools were testing out a new model for learning. The objective of these studies often was to resolve many of the basic fears or concerns of the desegregation action, rather than to evaluate the court decision per se. These 'concerns' centered around questions such as:

1. Will there be more discipline problems?
2. Will mixing the students by race affect the quality of education for white students?
3. Are the teachers prepared to work in a desegregated school? (Siggers 1971)

Many of the research studies involved only a one-year analysis of a recently desegregated school. In light of the controversy surrounding the court decision, the interpretations of the results of these studies were understandably mixed. Implementation certainly could not take place without secondary consequences and the mixed results reflected this. Conflict over discrepancy in results and problems in implementation have become a primary focus for many other studies and articles in an effort to explore why some desegregated students would improve in academic performance and others would not, or in explaining why aspiration levels would fall, in some situations and not in others.

In order to explain or to evaluate the difference in these results, other factors beyond race and achievement test scores were considered and evaluated in relation to the issues. For example, schools with "hostile atmospheres" would tend to have discipline problems and little, if any, improvement in achievement test scores of the minority students involved (Bernard 1958; Cusick and Ayling 1974). Research of this sort then leads to studies of the atmosphere (or "climate") inside schools and classrooms, in an attempt to determine those variables which promote or hinder achievement in desegregating schools. Studies such as these would consider variables such as attitudes of teachers (Dwyer 1960) or general school atmosphere (Hickerson 1966). Other studies were concerned with the improvement of desegregated students as measured by test scores (Stallings 1959; Hansen 1960; Crain 1971). As the research becomes more complex, it began, then, to link up test performance with other variables such as motivation, psychological stress (Katz 1964), aspirations and self-esteem (Epps 1975; Busk et al. 1973), or the proportion of minority students in a classroom (Koslim et al. 1972).

The most influential of these evaluative reports was that of James Coleman in the Educational Opportunity Survey of 1965, which attempted to provide a comprehensive evaluation of the schooling process in our country. His results were as controversial as they were unexpected in that he declared that families, not schools, were instrumental in determining student success in schooling (Coleman 1967). Thus, it mattered little, academically, where a child went to school. As a consequence, desegregating schools would seem to be a non-issue as far as student achievement was concerned.

The release of the Coleman report produced a new explosion of research and articles on desegregation. There was considerable analysis and reanalysis of his study (St. John 1974; McPartland 1969; Coleman 1967; Guthrie 1970; Jencks 1972; Mosteller and Moynihan 1972), not only of his results but of his methodology, his statistical analyses, and his conclusions.

Coleman himself continued to research the dimensions of the controversy, particularly the relation of busing, desegregation and white flight. Reactions to his research have reverberated from popular magazines (*People* 1976) to a critical analysis of his reports by Pettigrew and Greene, who criticized Coleman's methodology and his inability to distinguish between his own biases and the research results.

Christopher Jencks' work is an example of one of the reanalyses studies of the Coleman report. In *Inequality*, he summarizes three years of research at the Center for Educational Policy Research, where Jencks and other social scientists reanalyzed the Coleman data, and other similar bodies of data, and reevaluated the policy implications of Coleman's Equal Educational Opportunities Survey. Jencks' conclusion implied that the political and moral premises of our present policy stances must be changed in order to alleviate the poverty and inequality of opportunity now present. Here again, the school played a relatively minor role in promoting educational opportunity.

Needless to say, studies such as Coleman and Jencks have had considerable impact on the evaluation of the educational aspects of the desegregation issue. The results implied that desegregated schools were not viable instruments for policy action to equalize opportunities for black and whites.

In other studies of desegregation, sociological variables such as leadership, group function (Yarrow and Yarrow 1958; Vedlitz 1975), interracial friendship (Carter et al. 1975; Sachdeva 1973) and social contact (Pettigrew 1969) were correlated with the desegregation of schools, in order to measure the consequences involved in a desegregated situation for black and white students. Sachdeva and Carter found that school integration had a positive effect on the feelings of black and white students, that personal contact had been instrumental in improving interracial attitudes. Carter emphasized the need to consider peer acceptance in relation to the effects of desegregation. Vedlitz's study indicated a need to consider the commitment of the students toward racial integration in measuring the effectiveness of desegregation. The Yarrow and Yarrow study of a desegregated camp emphasized the role of the leadership style and other personal variables in the adaptation process which integration would involve.

The research literature also includes that schools differ substantially in the manner in which they have desegregated their school districts and would integrate their schools. Tracking, ability grouping (Orfield, 1975) and differential treatment (Yudof 1975) continue differential education experiences under the auspices of a desegregated school. Understandably, such factors could have serious effects on test scores and the levels of self-confidence or aspirations of students. These techniques of segregating students within a desegregated school are a much subtler means of second class treatment of minority students, but could be as or more psychologically damaging for minority students as a racially separated school building. There are important policy considerations involved here. A number of studies of social action programs have commented on the problems of implementation of policy plans. Many have touched upon a growing awareness of the problems involved in changing schools (Rivlin 1975; *Teachers College Record* Feb. 1976) which includes desegregation programs.

Concern with the student unrest of the late 1960s led to a number of studies of the relationship between student unrest and desegregated schools (Siggers 1971; Southern Educational Foundations, 1972; Yudof 1975). Two such studies are indicatives of how the analysis of student unrest has lead to a deeper understanding of the problem involved in a desegregated school.

The Southern Educational Foundation study of forty three southern cities found that many southern schools operated under shockingly inadequate desegregation plans, with many schools manipulating ability grouping in order to resegregate students within the schools. From their study, the Foundation concluded that the student unrest was symptomatic of the racism and the injustice found in many school districts of the south. Much of the student conflict was a result of racial hostility with some indication that the school administrations were either unwilling or unable to help resolve the basic problems responsible for such friction.

Increasingly, it becomes apparent that the administration can block, undermine, or promote the success of a desegregation plan. In analyzing a desegregated school, then, much of the burden of the success of the program should not be solely measured by the achievement test results of its students. The administration represents a central role in influencing the ramifications of desegregating a school. Test score results could only be reflective of underlying problems, at the most. Identification of the importance of the administration in policy implementation has lead to a discovery of more subtle factors, such as a 'hidden curriculum' (Yudof 1975) that serves as a means of retarding the implementation of a desegregated school's policy.

Yudof, in a more critical analysis of the problem of student unrest, maintained that unequal results in comparing black and white students by test scores, dropout rates, expulsion rates and so forth, are not simply a reflection of unfair rules or racism on the part of the administration. For him, the problem lies deeper in the socialization process inherent in our schools (1975:389), which includes specific codes of behavior that are often inconsistent with that known or permitted of the black students. This is the hidden curriculum that can serve as an arbitrary mechanism for segregation. To resolve this problem, Yudof recommended a structural reform of schools. For a policy maker, this perspective provides some insight into the crucial social aspects of the desegregation dilemma.

Research Results

What conclusions about desegregation can be drawn from the research so far reviewed? First, there is some evidence to suggest that desegregation benefits the academic achievement of black students. Though there seems to be some conflicting evidence, the research does show that the positive academic results outweigh the negative results. Second, there is even stronger evidence that white children fail to suffer any learning disadvantages from being in a desegregated school (Weinberg 1975). The range of variables contributing to these results, however, are wide and appear to vary according to degree of influence. Strongly correlated variables which must be considered are (a) the socio-economic status of the child's family, (b) the social-emotional character of a child's family background, and (c) his sense of academic achievement (Weinberg 1975). Social (peer) acceptance and 'control of the environment,' social structural environment, and the academic structuring of a school are other emerging variables that influence the research results.

As the study of desegregation and its related educational and social problems has grown, there has also been an expansion of research in related areas; studies on the educational needs of disadvantaged children, urban studies, and research on compensatory education. Other studies have raised questions about the moral, economic and political reasonableness of striving for equal education opportunities. In addition, the viability of education as a means of providing equal educational opportunities has been challenged (Jencks 1972). Thus, related philosophical arguments have been drawn into the desegregation arena in an attempt to understand the intrinsic capacities of such an action (Hodgson 1975) or of education—can education lead to long range equal economic opportunities for blacks and whites? (Jencks 1972) or of the nature of justice and equality (Rawls 1975; Levine and Bane 1975). Much of this one would suppose was an attempt to clarify the dynamics involved in providing equal educational opportunities for minority or disadvantaged children, in an attempt to reduce much of the controversy involved (Guthrie et al. 1970).

As desegregation has proven to be a complex research problem, it has made some contributions to the field of research and education. The research has identified many of the problems involved in providing education for children, including variables such as teacher-student interaction, influence from peer group attitudes, and cultural differences that interfere with learning. Moreover, it has clarified many of the factors involved with racial problems, as the influence of social economic status, genetics, family background, and such (Carter et al. 1975).

Meyer Weinberg has done extensive work in organizing and analyzing the literature on desegregation, outlining the conclusions according to variables identified in research on the effects of desegregated schools. His framework, though limiting in that it deals primarily with academic achievement and desegregation, is helpful in identifying those variables having specific types of impact. For instance, studies showing mixed results academically tended to attribute these results to ability grouping within a school or may not have taken social economic status into consideration, when analyzing the data.

Weinberg found, for example, that those studies showing no positive effect of interracial schooling in academic achievement did not control for intelligence, social economic status, or for pre-post test comparison. Clearly, without a standardized procedure in research design and analysis, design, methodology and analysis become variables to be considered when comparing studies. The resulting confusion can partially account for the difficulties then involved in making policy decisions concerning desegregation policies or related issues.

It is important to realize that an issue such as this should not be researched solely on a micro-level, but rather on a more macro-level involving other institutions in society. Not only are many of the contributing variables beyond control, in a research sense, but the effects cannot be definitely attributed to a specific action. Longitudinal studies are needed to observe the effects over time, of changes in desegregated students as compared to segregated students.

Problems in Research Findings

Finding conclusive research results in the desegregation literature emerging from classroom observation or school-based studies is extremely difficult. Often similar research studies when compared indicate conflicting results (Weinberg 1968). More often than not results from the importance attributed to different variables or from the contribution of variables are considered over all, rather than from methodological differences. An example of this type of conflict was outlined by Weinberg (1968), in two studies that attempted to interpret the cause of higher aspirations found in segregated black students as compared with desegregated black students. In one study, Elias Blake (1968) concluded that the higher aspiration levels of segregated students served as a defense measure by which these students were able to maintain self-esteem, thus providing positive ego support. Alan Wilson (1968) studied the same factor in public schools in Berkeley and reached a different conclusion. He held that the presence of higher aspiration levels among lower class blacks was a demonstration that a social minority can generate and maintain higher hopes than when integrated. Instead of interpreting this as a defense mechanism for the individual, he concluded that segregation prevented demoralization of the segregated. Wilson's implications, then, are that desegregation is damaging to the ego. The conflict becomes even more compounded when recourse to the literature shows other studies which indicate that while desegregated students may have lower aspiration levels than segregated black students, they tend to show higher levels of academic achievement and they are more likely to graduate from high school and to attend college (Crain 1971).

Another example of conflict over the interpretation of the research findings on desegregation can be seen in the controversy which resulted from a review of busing studies by David Armor (1972). Armor felt that none of the studies he reviewed were able to demonstrate conclusively that busing has had an effect on the academic achievement of black students. Moreover, he felt the data failed to support the theory that desegregation would reduce facial stereotypes, increase tolerance or improve race relations. Thus he concluded that other types of integration programs should be considered.

Armor's conclusions were met with considerable disagreement. Thomas Pettigrew, for example, argued that:

> Armor's thesis is predicated on viewing school desegregation as a technical matter, an inconvenient intervention whose merit must be judged solely by how well *black* children manage to adapt to it. Blacks are once again the "object" whose reactions should determine "what is good for them." The conditions faced by black children go unmeasured and ignored, and the whole context of American race relations is conveniently forgotten. (Weinberg 1968:68-70)

Besides disagreeing with Armor's premise for his conclusions, Pettigrew criticized Armor for the studies he selected for his conclusions, his lack of distinction between desegregated schools and integrated schools, as well as his unusually high standards for evaluating success and failure.

A review of the literature also indicates that one problem is that the concept of desegregation itself has become increasingly ambiguous over the years, both in the interpretation of the court order and in its relation to the purpose of education. According to Levin, the issue of desegregation has moved from that of morals to that of test score evaluation. He continues by stating:

> Desegregation seems to hinge on whether or not it will improve test scores of students (minority) rather than considering what kinds of education policy regarding school racial patterns is consistent with our democratic ideals. (1975:239)

Here, Levin points to the effect that changing policy on desegregation can have on research. What began as an attempt to discover what was happening in schools after desegregation ended in a continuing debate over the meaning and validity of test scores. Though these measures do provide insight into school and student performance, they are insufficient for the analysis of such a major change process as desegregation. Certainly the courts were very concerned with the education of minority children:

> Segregation of white and colored children in public schools has a detrimental effect upon the colored children. The impact is greater when it has the sanction of the law; for the policy of separating the races is usually interpreted as denoting the inferiority of the Negro group. A sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn. Segregation with the sanction of law, therefore, has a tendency to retard the educational and mental development of Negro children and to deprive them of some of the benefits they would receive in a racially integrated school system. (McMillan 1975:160)

But education was to serve as the vehicle of social integration and not vice versa. Much of the literature we have reviewed approaches the problem as if the interpretation of the court decision were an educational issue and so has evaluated the court decision according to the educational results accumulated. A number of researchers have concluded that the educational benefits of desegregation so far have not been those expected or hoped for:

> As to the educational advantages of desegregation the benefits, at least those that

> are measureable, by available testing instruments, have been generally disappointing. A survey of the voluminous available studies indicates that some black students have improved academically, others had lost ground, and still others remain about the same. (Bell 1975:29)

The disappointment is well founded, but the disappointing results of the educational advantages are not the only measure of desegregation. Education was only a means by which to begin ending unequal treatment of minority groups. The court wanted to end segregation foremost by ending the legal sanctioning of such practices. The use of the behavioral factors to prove a point concerning the damage done by segregated treatment is a separate premise from that of attempting to remain consistent with the democratic philosophy governing our country.

The following quote by Ronald Edmunds is a clear example of the confusion of the two social goals felt to be premises for the court decision: equality within our society, and equal education for all.

> The author's experience in desegregation prompts the prediction that client interest will divide into two broad categories: that at or above the sociological-economic indicators that determine upward mobility working class and middle class status will broadly agree on desegregation as an automatic instrument of instructional improvement in the schooling of their children; those of relatively low social economic status will also be committed to instructional improvement in the schooling of their children; but will be far less committed to desegregation as an automatic instrument of such improvement. (1973:36)

These goals are two separate issues, though education (and especially by utilizing desegregation) has been seen as the means of achieving these two goals simultaneously. The fact that education, and thus desegregation, falls short of meeting these needs is visible in the discontent over the results of desegregated schools.

Though the concern for educational outcomes of minority children is well-founded, it can be separated from the racial segregation-desegregation controversy. Quotes such as:

> The truly integrated school is an educational and democratic ideal, but there is no reason to shun other alternatives when the ideal is not available. (Bell 1975:36)

clearly confuses the purpose of desegregation, in that there should be no alternative to one's rights to education. Here, Bell is suggesting that other educational alternatives be examined when desegregated schools do not achieve the educational goals of society.

Desegregation can also be seen as a moral good in and of itself, and not exclusively as a means to other benefits (Crain 1974). A longitudinal study proposed by Robert Crain emphasized the need to clarify desegregation as an indirect effect upon the educational process rather than as a direct educational function. The thrust of this proposal stressed the need to analyze desegregation in and of itself. Previous research has shown more concern with the educational success or failure of the court decision, as previously stated.

A Note on the Macro-Micro Levels of Analysis

In both the review of the court decisions and of the literature on review in classroom effects, a common problem seems obvious: the confusion over micro and macro levels of analysis. As Blalock (1967:21) has observed:

> One of the most challenging problems that continually arise in almost all substantive fields within the social sciences is that of just how one translates back and forth between the macro level, where groups are the units of analysis, and the micro level where the focus is on individuals. The problems are both conceptual and empirical.

The line between these aspects is sometimes subtle but always important to keep in mind. One can all too easily fall victim to the polar fates or psychological reductionism and/or the ecological fallacy. Yet, it is advanced that the field methods approach is particularly useful in coping with this problem. Practitioners of this style commonly argue that one of the benefits of their approach is that it considers the *gestalt* of any given problem. Indeed, it is argued that if one looks at the history of participant observation research, both in anthropology and in sociology, some significant gaps in current desegregation will be identified.

REFERENCES CITED

Armor, David J.

1972 The Evidence on Busing. Public Interest Summer:90-126.

He discussed the "contact theory" of Gordon Allport as related to the problems of desegregation and various integration policy models. In relation to these, Armor examines the research and studies done on desegregation. He concludes that none of these studies were able to demonstrate conclusively that integration has had an effect on academic achievement as measured by standardized tests. The data failed to verify the policy axiom that integration should reduce racial stereotypes, increase tolerance, or improve race relations. The long term effects did show, however, that bused students were more likely to go on to college than the control group students.

Armor felt that overall the data disproved the policy model and thus concluded that some other approach should be taken.

Bell, Derrick A., Jr.

1975 The Burden of Brown on Blacks: History-based Observations on a Land Mark Decision. North Carolina Central Law Journal Fall 7, L;27-39.

He discussed what has happened since the Brown decision in terms of improved educational opportunity for black children. He concludes that more than a court decision is necessary to achieve this end, and that alternatives should possibly be considered.

Berman, Daniel M.

1966 Our Children's Burden. New York: Vintage Books.

The author outlines the developmental stages of the Brown decision, from the judicial point of view, as well as describes the people and situations involved.

Bernard, Viola W.

1958 School Desegregation: Some Psychiatric Implications. Psychiatry 21, 2:149-158.

She discusses the psychological problems involved in the large scale social readjustment due to desegregation affecting both black and white students.

Busk, Patricia, et al.

1973 Effects of Schools' Racial Composition on the Self-Concept of Black and White Students. Journal of Educational Research 67, 2:57-63.

This is an investigation of self-esteem and self-concept of ability of black and white students attending integrated and segregated schools, focusing on the sixth, seventh and eighth grade students of six parochial schools, of similar social status.

Carter, Donald, Susan DeTine, June Spero, and Forrest Benson

1975 Peer Acceptance and School Related Variables in an Integrated Junior High School. Journal of Educational Psychology 67:267-73.

The authors studied interracial peer acceptance as related to nine predictor variables: grade point average, IQ, attendance, self-concept, sex, race, age, years in school, and classroom racial composition. Grade point average and sex became the most prominant predictors of acceptance for white students. Race was a significant predictor variable for academic and social acceptance by black subjects. The authors feel there is a need to consider peer acceptance in relation to the effects of integration.

Coleman, James S. et al.

1966 Equality of Educational Opportunity. U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

This is a report in response to section 402 of Civil Rights Act of 1964, which was to make a report to Congress concerning the lack of availability of equal educational opportunities for an individual by reason of race, color, religion or national origin in public educational institutions at all levels in the U. S. The report includes details of the survey design and procedures, type of tests used, and questionnaires to teachers, students, principals and superintendents.

The racial categories were social, rather than anthropological, and addressed four major questions:

1. extension of racial and ethnic segregation in public schools
2. whether or not schools offer quality education (quality determined by various criteria) at an opportunity open equally to all
3. learning as related to achievement tests
4. identify the relationship between student achievement and kinds of schools attended.

Coleman, James S.

1967 Toward Open Schools. Public Interest 9:20-7.

This article includes some of the implications of the Office of Education report on Equality of Educational Opportunity, and the reception of it by the U. S. public. The author discusses the variable necessary to provide the most efficient means to improve lower class achievement: family background. He suggests a wide variety of means for overcoming this from tutoring to performance contracting.

Crain, Robert L.

1971 School Integration and the Academic Achievement of Negroes. Sociology of Education 44:1-26.

This is a result of a survey of 1600 adult Negroes living in Northern metropolitan areas. The findings show that scores on verbal tests for those who attend college increased more than those in segregated schools. Also seems likely that this can be attributed to the character of classmates, irrespective of classmates, irrespective of race. Integrated schools seem to establish social and psychological preconditions for achievement.

Crain, Robert L. et al.

1974 Design for a National Longitudinal Study of School Desegregation, Vols. 1 and 2. Rand Corporation.

This is a report on preliminary study for longitudinal research in school desegregation.

Crain, Robert L. and Morton Inger

1966 School Desegregation in New Orleans, Office of Education, Department of HEW Project, National Opinion Center, University of Chicago, Ill.

This is a comparative study of the failure of social control. It studied the reaction of a city when forced to desegregate, and the problems, both legal and social, which affected the social structure of the community.

Cusick, Philip and Richard Ayling

1974 Biracial Interaction in an Urban Secondary School Social Review, pp. 486-94.

This article dealt with the lack of information about interracial interaction in a desegregated school. It attempted to assess the extent and the nature of this interaction. In addition, it included a case study of a high school in a northern industrial city, including both black and white students, of lower middle economic status. The authors found a lack of mechanisms for bringing together the two isolated hostile parties.

Dwyer, Robert J.

1960 Reactions of White Teachers in Desegregated Schools. Sociology and Social Research 44,5:348-51.

The author utilized questionnaires to measure the attitude-opinions of white teachers in five schools concerning desegregation. This is part of a larger study completed in 1956. In all but one school system it was nearly unanimous agreement that the desegregation program was highly successful, with deficiencies attributed to past education and environmental conditions. A large group was reluctant to work with an integrated faculty.

Edmonds, Ronald R.

1973 Advocating Inequity: A Critique of the Civil Rights Attorney in Class Action Desegregation Suits. The Black Law Journal 3,2.

The author discusses the Brown decision as related to social equity for class and race. He sees black pupil performance as the primary criterion for judging the effectiveness of judged action to correct social injustice of Black children. He offers 3 approaches to solving this problem from the civil rights attorney's vantage point.

Epps, Edgar G.

1975 The Impact of School Desegregation of Aspirations, Self-Concepts and Other Aspects of Personality. Law and Contemporary Problems Part II. 39,2:300-14.

This article showed mixed results in studying the effect of desegregation. The author discusses and studies the results of research on aspirations and self-esteem, relating these results to the role of the reference group, a sense of environmental control, of internal control, and of the teacher's characteristics, which were found to have an impact on one's internal control. Epps found that blacks seem to rely less on school achievement for self-esteem and peer influence appears to be more important.

Guthrie, James W., George B. Kleindorfer, Henry M. Levin, and Robert T. Stout

1970 Schools and Inequality. The Urban Coalition. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

This report is based on 17 research studies including that of Coleman, and suggests that school features such as teacher salary, experience, academic preparation and pupil-teacher ratio do in fact have an effect on academic achievement.

Hansen, Carl F.

1960 Scholastic Performance of Negro and White Pupils in the Integrated Public Schools of the District of Columbia. Harvard Educational Review 30,3:216-36.

Hansen discusses the effects of desegregation on the education of children in public schools in Washington, D.C. viewing this as a part of an effort to improve the quality of instruction and other factors affecting learning. He found that Negro students have performed somewhat better since desegregation as compared to pre-desegregation, with the white students showing no change.

Hickerson, Nathaniel

1966 Physical Integration Alone is Not Enough. Journal of Negro Ed. 35:110-6.

This is a discussion of the effects of the "quality" of integration of schools, the feelings of rejection, interiority etc. that's transmitted to a negro student at a de facto segregated school. Unless attitudes are improved, mere physical integration is not enough.

Jencks, Christopher and Marsha Brown

1975 The Effects of Desegregation on Student Achievement: Some New Evidence From the Equality of Educational Opportunity Survey. Sociology of Education 48,1:126-140.

This paper deals with the limitations of the Coleman report (EEOS data). The main concern is with a lack of longitudinal data, so they compared 6th graders scores with 1965 1st graders scores. The data results suggest a relationship between achievement test scores, as to what ratio maximizes student achievement (51-75% white school shows high scores in relation to national norms). For high school students, racial composition did not hold any influence on academic achievement.

Katz, Irwin

1968 Review of Evidence Relating to Effects of Desegregation on the Intellectual Performance of Negroes. *In* Policy Issues in Urban Education. New York: The Free Press.

He summarizes the studies relevant to the process of desegregation, and the effects of desegregation as well as the implications from the theories of social psychology. He examines the conditions which, accompanying desegregation, are positively or negatively related to improving school performance of those students involved in the process.

Koslin, Sandra, Bertrum Koslin, and Richard Pargomet

1972 Classroom Racial Balance and Students Interracial Attitudes. Sociology of Education 45:386-407.

This is a study of the relationship between racial balance and the interracial attitudes were found to be more favorable in balanced than unbalanced classes. Thus the results suggest a strong relationship between classroom racial balance within desegregated schools and the students interracial attitudes. They identified balanced as 25% black and 75% white. They felt a need to explore the causal relationship between racial balance and attitudes, especially for educational implications.

Levin, Harry M.

1975 Education, Life Chances and the Courts: the Role of Social Science Evidence. Law and Contemporary Problems 39,2.

He outlines the lack of an acceptable analysis of the relationship between schooling and adult attainment, as well as the existing hypotheses as related to these 2 factors.

He concludes that the amount of schooling a person receives has considerable effect on adult success though this is independent of the cognitive skills attained from the educational process.

The courts and policy makers have focused primarily on the cognitive skill approach, which has shifted the issue of desegregation from morals to achievement scores.

Levine, Donald M. and Mary Jo Bane

1975 The Inequality Controversy: Schooling and Distributive Justice. New York: Basic Book, Inc.

These are a collection of articles in response to the policy controversy concerning equality in education, and especially *Inequality*, by Christopher Jencks. This book attempts to clear up the confusion by providing some perspectives on the issues of education and distributive justice.

McMillan, James B.

1975 Social Science and the District Court: The Observations of a Journeyman Trial Judge. Law and Contemporary Problems. Part I, 39,1: 157-63.

The author discusses the legal problems of school desegregation, in light of his own experiences with the courts, relating them to the role of social science, and the role of the court with such a social issue, concluding that social science is entitled to a place in legal decisions concerning social problems.

McPartland, James

1969 The Relative Influence of School and of Classroom Desegregation on the Academic Achievement of Ninth Grade Negro Students. Journal of Social Issues 25,3:93-102.

The author looked at desegregation at the level of the school and at the level of the classroom, using the Office of Education survey information to compare the influence of schooling at these two levels (Educational Opportunities Survey, 1965). McPartland showed that the potential effects of desegregation can be offset by inner school "segregation," while classroom desegregation had a positive advantage for black students.

Mosteller, Frederick and Daniel P. Moynihan

1972 On Equality of Educational Opportunity. New York: Random House.

A collection of essays resulting from the Harvard seminar for a reanalysis of the Colemen report and the data upon which it was based.

People Weekly

1975 The Sociologist Blamed for Busing Says It Has Backfired. Dec.-Jan.

This popular consumption magazine, in a discussion of what their editors refer to as "The 25 Most Intriguing People of 1975," cites James Coleman and the current controversy surrounding busing. We refer to this article only to show the extent to which the Coleman Report has been publicized.

Pettigrew, Thomas F.

1969 Racially Separate or Together? Journal of Social Issues 25,1.

Pettigrew studied the changes in racial interaction as social interaction norms change in the society. This is an analysis of where we, as a society, stand in relation to segregation-desegregation and progress toward social integration. He explores various interaction theories and the factors leading to reducing prejudice assumptions that are underlying. He calls for a mixed intergration-enrichment strategy.

Rawls, John

1975 A Theory of Justice. *In* The Inequality Controversy: Schooling and Distributive Justice. Donald M. Levine and Mary Jo Bane, Eds. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

This article, a reprint from Rawls' book, *A Theory of Justice*, deals with the area of equality, opportunity and our democratic philosophies governing these. He deals with democratic equality, the difference principle, and distributive justice, which may offer a new perspective to the problem of inequality, as related to social justice.

Rivlin, Alice M. and P. Michael Timpans

1975 Planned Variation in Education. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institute.

These articles are a result of a conference of experts on the planned variation experience, in April 1973. This conference was to answer questions concerning the failure of planned variation experiements (Follow Through and Headstart) to achieve the objectives desired, or to show that one method of improving education was superior to the others.

The articles discuss what happened to the programs at the planning, executing and evaluating stages in order to assess what could be learned from their experience.

Sachdeva, Darshan

1973 A Measurement of Changes in Interracial Student Attitudes in Desegregated Schools. Journal of Educational Psychology 66,9:418-22.

The author measured the change in interracial attitudes of students of students in desegregated junior high schools using a set of attitude items (19). The findings suggested that this school integration had a positive effect on the feelings and attitudes of Negro and white students. The author also found that personal contact has been effective in improving interracial attitudes.

St. John, Nancy H.

1971 School Integration, Classroom Climate and Achievement. Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., Dept of HEW, Washington D.C., ERIC.

The purpose of the study was to search for factors influencing the achievement of black and white elementary pupils in urban schools of varying racial and social composition. She tested children in 36 sixth grade classrooms for the effect of roles, interracial relationships, and the influence of teachers on the classroom racial achievement relationships. The results showed the importance of teacher style as related to academic growth. St. John also found a positive relationship between the percentage of whites in a school and the academic achievement.

Siggers, Kathleen

1971 Desegregation in Sacramento, Berkeley, Pasadena, & Shaker Heights (Ohio).ERIC.California University, Riverside Western Regional School Desegregation Projects.

These are four cases of school integration illustrating that eliminating racial isolation has been shown to have no detrimental effect on majority children and minority children are benefited by improved achievement scores and IQ scores. All benefit attitudinally, but these occur only some of the time and under favorable circumstances, depending upon how the problem is handled.

Southern Educational Foundation

1972 It's Not Over in the South: School Desegregation in 43 Southern Cities 18 years after *Brown*. Southern Educational Foundations Atlanta, Georgia: Urban Coalition, Washington, D.C.

This study focused on the school desegregation in 43 cities in the South, making recommendations from their results concerning: compliance with the law, shcool desegregation plans, resegregation action, student unrest, suspension and expulsion, transportation and such problems that are occuring in these schools.

Stallings, Frank H.

1959 A study of the Immediate Effects of Integration on Scholastic Achievement in the Louisville Public Schools. Journal of Negro Education 28:439-44.

This study deals with the concern of effect of desegregation on scholastic standards in schools. It discusses the possible effects on Negro students, especially for motivation of the students. Stallings covered the immediate effects of integration on achievement. Also he points out that the location of the study was favorable to integration.

Vedlitz, Arnold

1975 Factors Affecting the Attitudes of Black High School Students Toward "Freedom of Choice" School Integration. Negro Educational Review 26,1.

This is a study of student involvement in a black school and the students attitude toward integration. It involves a measure of commitment to racial integration, white mistrust and what these mean for freedom of choice integration.

Weinberg, Meyer

1965 Research on School Desegregation: Review and Prospect. Chicago: Integrated Education Associates.

This is a collection of research results of studies showing the effects of desegregation on student performance, academically and socially, as well as of the teachers and the schools as a whole.

1968a Desegregation Research: An Appraisal. Phi Delta Kappan.

This includes a summary of the research findings and studies done on various aspects of desegregation from 1958 to 1968, including many unpublished findings. The topics ranged from the effects of desegregation and academic achievement to self-esteem, peer group interaction, and the role of the teacher in desegregating a school. The findings included studies done on other minority groups and problems peculiar to their cultural differences.

1968b Integrated Education. Beverly, Hills California: The Glencoe Press.

This is a reader, containing a selection of articles from the magazine publication *Integrated Education*, which is devoted to school integration.

1975 The Relationship Between School Desegration and Academic Achievement: A Review of the Research. Law and Contemporary Problems 39,2.

He found two areas of concerns in desegregation literature:

1. Very few studies suggest that desegregation schools would lower academic achievement of blacks
2. No evidence supports that desegregation lowers white achievement.

He also identified factors which affect the general desegregation effects, but are difficult to study:

1. family background
2. students academic aptitude

He outlined various types of studies and why they reached the results they did:

1. those that showed positive effects in academic achievement of interracial schooling
2. studies showing mixed effects of interracial schooling on academic achievement
3. studies showing no positive effect of interracial schooling on academic achievement
4. studies showing negative effects
5. studies showing the effect of busing

Wilson, Alan, B

1959 Residential Segregation of Social Classes and Aspirations of High School Boys, American Sociological Review 24,6:836-45.

The author found that school distributing tends to separate youth of different social strata, which modifies values and aspirations. Differences in the attributes of the membership group are shown to affect aspirations while relevant "personal variables" are controlled. Thus the "ethos" of the school seems also to affect

academic achievement, occupational aspirations and political preferences.

Yarrow, Leon, J. and Marian R. Yarrow

1958 Leadership and Interpersonal Change. Journal of Social Issues 14,1.

This section examined the importance of the leadership role and how it related to the group and the situation, in terms of the impact on the leader, and the effects of variation in leader on the adjustment of the children. The data found the counselor to be pirvotal in determining the success of desegregation.

Yudof, Mark, G.

1975 Suspension and Expulsion of Black Students from the Public Schools: Academic Capital Punishment and The Constitution, Law and Contemporary Problems, Part II, 39,2:374-411.

This is a discussion of why there is a disproportionate representation of blacks in relation to the reates of expulsion and suspension, and whether or not this is racism or a reality. The author discusses the reasons for black expulsion rates and then examines the constitutional and policy framework for dealing with this situation. Most behavior of the blacks has been asserted against the "hidden Curriculum" of the school. Unequal results (as far as expulsion rates and such) do not simply indicate unfair rules and procedures, but can be seen as related to the socialization process.

Additional Readings

Armor, David J.

1972 School and Family Effects on Black and White Achievement: A Re-examination of the USOE Data. *In* On Equality of Educational Opportunity. Frederick Mosteller and Daniel P. Moynihan, Eds. New York: Random House, pp. 168-229.

He discusses two criticisms of the original Coleman report: that the first conclusion (that blacks have just as adequate school facilities as whites in most parts of the country) did not adequately measure the school's characteristics and therefore the absence of black and white differences is not a true representation of the actual situation. The second criticism was concerned with the conclusion that aside from the distribution of school quality the effects of staff and facilities on achievement are not large for either blacks or whites, especially when compared to the effects of family background.

Armor reexamined the complete elementary school data, to provide another independent assessment of the data, but reached similar conclusions to that of Coleman.

Armstrong, Clariette and A. James Gregor

1964 Integrated Schools and Negro Character Development. Psychiatry 27:69-72.

This is a discussion of the hypothesis concerning the possible contribution of school integration to Negro character development and possible contributions to neurotic illnesses. They conclude that children may be forced into situations where they must evaluate their race, negatively, which would lead to personality damage.

Banfield, Edward C.

1970 The Unheavenly City. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co.

Problems of housing, welfare, crime and other social problems in the city are discussed. An excellent chapter on education is included.

Banko, Ronald and Mary Ellen Dipasquale

1970 A Study of the Educational Effectiveness of Integration: A Comparison of Pupil Achievement Before and One Year After Integration: A Survey of the Attitudes of Parents, Teachers, Students, Principals, involved in the Program. Buffalo Public Schools, N.Y. ERIC ED 058 576.

They surveyed the effects of busing, from segregated to prodominantly white schools, grades 5-7. Findings included:

1. black achievement was higher in integrated than in non-integrated schools
2. whites don't suffer academically due to integration

3. principals and teachers in receiving schools believe that the integration program demonstrated positive results
4. both black and white parents felt it was educationally sound
5. both black and white students felt it was a good idea
6. integration effects varied according to age level, for older children tended to have set attitudes
7. those students with emotional disturbances seem to cause problems.

Bard, Harry

1958 Observations on Desegregation in Baltimore: Three Years Later. Teachers College Record February:268.

This is a general discussion of desegregation in Baltimore, including the problems faced by teachers, parents, students and community, adjustments need to be made, and such. The article maintained a very optimistic perspective toward desegregation.

Bonacich, Edna and Robert F. Goodman

1972 Deadlock in School Desegregation: A Case Study of Inglewood, California. New York: Praeger Publishers.

This is a discussion of the situation of desegregation of a California school district, and the factors involved in the failure of the system to desegregate. Particularly of interest are the situations which occurred within the school, and the segregation problem in the community. Overall, a quantitative case study approach was used to study the desegregation problem, including the background of the students, social economic status, and racial factors.

Bradley, Gladyce

1963 Interracial Experiences of Youth in Baltimore in Out-of-School Life. The Journal of Educational Research. 57, 4:181-184.

This is part of a larger study which sought to determine the experiences of a group of Negro youth in interracial activities outside of school life, particularly in relation to home visitation and mannership in community groups.

1964 Friendship Among Students in Desegregated Schools. Journal of Negro Education 33:90-2.

This is part of a study which focuses on determining the extent to which interracial friendships were experienced by a sample of a Negro population in Baltimore, examining the responses of college and secondary schools.

Campbell, John D. and Marian R. Yarrow

1958 Personal and Situational Variables in Adaptation to Change. The Journal of Social Issues 14, 1.

This section examined some of the personal and situational variables involved in the camp desegregation. They examined the differences in adjusting according to age, sex, and race, as well as examined aggressive behavior and friendship preferences. They found it difficult to conclude relationships between influence conditions and the development of changed attitudes and behavior.

Carrigan, Patricia M.

1969 School Desegregation via Compulsory Pupil Transfer: Early Effects on Elementary School Children. Final Report. Ann Arbor Public Schools, Michigan, Office of Education, Department of HEW, Washington, D.C.

This is an extensive study of Ann Arbor's first year of desegregation, through a reassignment of Negro students throughout white schools. The research focused on exploring academic, social, behavioral and attitudinal characteristics in those transferred, in a racially mixed group from one school and in a white-receiving school. The gains made by transferred students (though some existed) were smaller than gains made by the other two groups. This report included results of a follow-up survey two years later, with students just holding their own.

Catolona, Thelma P.

1967 The Process of Mutual Redifinition—Counseling and Teaching Children from Urban Slums. *In* The Urban R's: Race

Relations as the Problem. Robert Dentler et al., Eds. New York: Praeger.

The author examines the failure of communication between staff and children in slum schools, as it affects learning, leads to hostility and frustration, and as it results in cultural differences.

Clark, Kenneth B.

1955 Prejudice and Your Child. Boston: Beacon Press.

This book is a psychological study of the effects of prejudice and segregation on both black and white children. It contains advice to schools, parents and community for working on feelings of prejudice in children.

Cohen, David K.

1968 Policy for the Public Schools: Compensation and Integration. Harvard Educational Review 38, 1:114-137.

This is a discussion of the policy question in urban education of whether to improve Negro achievement through the quality of the school or through desegregation of schools. The author discusses the educational outcomes of desegregation academically, behaviorally and valuatively, while segregated programs tended to compound the racial issue.

1969 Policy for the Public Schools: Compensation and Integration. Equal Educational Opportunity. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Educational Review, Harvard University Press.

Cohen examined the implications of research for national policy as related to the Coleman Report and to racial inequality in educational opportunities.

Cohen, David K., Thomas F. Pettigrew, and Robert T. Riley

1972 Race and the Outcomes of Schooling. *In* Equality of Educational Opportunity. Frederick Mosteller and Daniel P. Moynihan, Eds. New York: Random House, pp. 343-368.

This article looks into the question of the relationship between racial contexts and achievement, as it investigates the impact of racial composition and school interracial climates upon student achievement. They found a modest relationship between classroom racial composition and verbal ability.

Coleman, James S.

1966 Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, OE-3800.

This well-known report was undertaken to analyze differences among educational facilities available to various groups of children in the United States. It suggests, among other things, that sources of inequality of educational opportunity are "explained" more fully by home and community factors than by school.

Coles, Robert

1963 The Desegregation of Southern Schools: A Psychiatric Study. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

This is an exploration of feelings, social reactions and psychological reactions of both white and black children to desegregated schools, to black and white relations, and to the race issue as a whole.

Covello, Leonard with Guido D'Agostino

1958 The Heart is the Teacher. New York: McGraw-Hill.

The author describes his community school and provides many insights into education as a community enterprise. This book is a must for anyone interested in school-community relations.

Crain, Robert L.

1966 School Desegregation in the North: Eight Comparative Case Studies of Community Structure and Policy Making. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago.

This is an analysis of the way in which fifteen American city school systems made decisions concerning school integration, and how these cities compared, overall, in the way they dealt with the Brown decision.

Crockett, Harry J.

1957 A Study of Some Factors Affecting the Decision of Negro High School Students to Enroll in Previously All White High Schools. Social Forces 35, 4:251-6.

This is a study of the effects of voluntary desegregation in relation to hypotheses about student (Negro) motivation towards integration in relation to social economic status, IQ, sex, grade level in St. Louis in 1955. No significance was found between the two groups according to SES, IQ, reading ability, mean grades or sex. Seniors were less likely to transfer than those of the lower three grades.

Crooks, Roland C.
1970 The Effects of an Interracial Preschool Program Upon Racial Preferences, Knowledge of Racial Differences, and Racial Identification. Journal of Social Issues 26, 4:137-144.
The author compared white and black preschoolers according to racial preferences, knowledge of racial differences, and racial identification. This was an attempt to measure an enriched preschool program. Both races rejected Negro dolls, which may be a results of earlier socialization.

Day, Noel A.
1969 The Case for All-Black Schools. Equal Educational Opportunity. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Educational Review, Harvard University Press.
Day discusses the shifts in responsibility of equality of opportunity from the child, as he is disadvantaged, to the school and the community.

Denmark, Florence, et al.
1967 Communication Patterns in Integrated Classrooms and Pre-Integration Subject Variables as They Affect the Academic Achievement and Self-Concept of Previously Segregated Children. ERIC.
This research project was conducted to determine the effects of desegregation after one year on lower class children in New York State suburbs. They found that pre-integration variables such as self-concept and cognitive style related to verbal ability scores, though it varied by grade and sex. They found that teacher ratings were inversely related to students' self-concepts and unrelated to measures of cognitive style and verbal ability.
Black friendship choices showed that interracial classroom interaction was related positively to academic achievement, but inversely related to self-concept.

Dentler, Robert and Constance Elkins
1967 Intergroup Attitudes, Academic Performance and Race Composition. The Urban R's: Race Relations as the Problem in Urban Education. New York: Praeger.
The article offers suggestions for planful desegregation, by describing the state of intergroup attitudes among young urban school children.

Dentler, Robert A., Bernard Mackler, and Mary Ellen Warshauer, Eds.
1967 The Urban R's: Race Relations as the Problem in Urban Education. New York: Praeger.
This is a collection of articles focusing on race relations as the urgent problem of public schools. The studies that are included were conducted between 1964 and 1966.

Drachler, Norman
1974 Educational Effects of Integration. Paper presented at the Conference on School Desegregation: *Brown* Plus Twenty and Into the Future. ERIC.
This is a review of the press and the media since the Brown decision, with conclusions drawn about the situation of integration vs. segregation. Due to the decentralization of schools, it is difficult to make a concerted effort for educational planning. The author assessed the need for a national or well-developed plan for meeting the challenge of Brown.

Dyer, Henry S.
1969 School Factors and Equal Educational Opportunity. Equal Educational Opportunity. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Educational Review, Harvard University Press.
The article surveys and studies the effects of schooling on achievement and cognitive development. Dyer reached different conclusions than Coleman, on the issue of education.

Evans, Charles L.
1973 Desegregation Study II: Academic Effects on Bused Black and Receiving

White Students, 1972-3. Fort Worth Independent School District, Texas: Department of Research and Evaluation, ERIC.

This is a continued evaluation of court-ordered desegregation plan implemented in 1971-2. In ascertaining the effects for achievement in grades three, four, and five, for black and white students, they found that bused blacks showed significant gains over non-bused. The white students made normal academic progress.

Fancher, Betsy

1970 Voices From the South: Black Students Talk About Their Experiences in Desegregated Schools. Special Report. Southern Regional Council, Atlanta, Georgia, U.S. Office of Education, Dept. of HEW, ERIC.

These are interviews of students from four widely diverse southern communities about their experiences in desegregated schools. The objective of the survey was to answer questions concerning integration, such as whether the students were just a bitter vocal minority or were they a new wave of millitancy as a result of disillusionment with integration. The responses ranged from bitter negativism to cautious optimism.

Fancher concluded from these interviews that there was no mass movement toward separation, but that students were losing faith in the system. Thus the educational structure is being threatened by archaic approaches to learning, and not by racial problems.

Fantini, Mario D. and Gerald Weinstein

1968 Making Urban Schools Work. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

This is one of the best of the rash of books describing the problems of urban education. This one proposes some reasonable solutions.

Farley, Reynolds

1975 Residential Segregation and Its Implications for School Integration. Law and Contemporary Problems 39, 2.

The author discusses the decrease in school segregation, which dropped dramatically since 1967 largely as a result of federal court orders. He relates the factor of residential segregation to the difficulty of school integration, which makes it more difficult to accomplish integration; and the fact that the increased proportion of black students in large school districts makes busing more and more necessary.

Felice, Lawrence G.

1974 Busing, Desegregation and Student Self-Concept. National Center for Educational Research and Development. Washington, D.C.: Regional Research Program.

The article shows the results of findings from the first two years of a three-year study evaluating the effects of court ordered desegregation in Waco, Texas. The purpose of the study was to determine:

1. minority student achievement
2. degree of interracial cooperation and acceptance in school
3. the effect of busing on these.

Interracial climate is identified by intergroup hositlity and interracial friendship.

The author wanted to compare students' perceptions of the interracial climate as related to differences in student achievement. He studied 7th and 8th grade students of a stratified random scale.

The author felt that negative attitude toward integration and intergroup hostility would lead to decreased self-concept and achievement. The data show improved attitudes toward integration and increased numbers of white friends and higher self-concepts, but lower academic achievenemt test scores. Researchers felt that it may be too soon to conclude, from the desegregation attempts as of yet.

Foshay, A Wells

1970 The Professional as Educator. New York: Teachers College Press.

This collection includes papers by Fantini, Ianni, Foshay and Talcott Parsons, which propose several models for relating schools of education to the school and to community.

Frank, James H.
1973 The Influence of Non-White Pupil Classroom Composition on Classroom Quality. New York: Columbia University, Institute of Administrative Research.
Frank attempted to answer the question of whether the classroom ratio of nonwhite to white influences the quality of the behavior of the participants in integrated classroom. He based it on four key concepts of classroom behavior: individualization, interpersonal regard, group activity end creativity. If one includes the concept of racial balance in the criterion of the quality of classroom behavior, then the findings suggest 41-60% black to white pupil composit on is the best.

Gerald, Harold, B. and Norman Miller
1975 School Desegregation. New York: Plenum Press.
This is a study of California's Riverside School District busing program. As it began ten years ago, it offers an excellent situation to study the effects of desegregation, before and after, for the long range implications. In the study, they were able to measure variables such as family background, personality, achievement, speech problems, attitudes and adjustment for the children involved. Teacher attitudes and the social climate of the school over a six year period was also measured. This study was done in an attempt to examine the relationship between IQ, motivation, emotional adjustment, achievement and the desegregated school. The results showed no clear relationship between IQ and academic achievement for black and white students, regardless of the setting, segregated or desegregated. Though all parents emphasized the importance of school, their attitudes differed on other values, which might have influenced achievement motivation. The bias of the teacher was found to affect the achievement of minority students. There were ethnic differences in personality prior to desegregation and post desegregation results revealed few changes along these lines. Black anxiety did increase, which would affect motivation. Overall, they concluded that minority children showed no overall benefit in achievement as a result of desegregation.

Gross, Ronald and Beatrice
1969 Radical School Reform. New York: Simon and Schuster.
This book brings together the already familiar opinions of the radical shcool reformers. However the uninitiated may want to refer to complete books of these reformers which include Kohl, Goodman, Dozol, Friedenberg, Neill, Holt, Herndon and others.

Haggstrom, Warren
1968 Segregation, Desegregation and Negro Personality. Integrated Education. Beverly Hills, California: The Glencoe Press.
This is an analysis of the psychological effects of segregation and desegretation.

Hawley, Willis D. and Ray D. Rist
1975 On the Future Implications of School Desegregation: Some Considerations. Law and Contemporary Problems 38,2:412-26.
This is a discussion of desegregation and he desired results in education for black students. The article attempts to tie together some of the complex problems involved in the desegregation process. It outlines the four general goals to which desegregation aspired, and the consequences since the Brown decision:
1. the positive influence on psychological consequences
2. the effects of desegregation on academic achievement
3. the effects of desegregation of race relations
4. the focus on equal access to school resources and opportunites for post-school success.

Heath, Robert W. and Roy Larnders
1969 Interviews with Seven Black High School Students. Research and Development Memorandum #59. Stanford University: U.S. Office of Education (Dept. of HEW), Bureau of Research.
This is a transcription of interviews with

seven black high school students in the Spring and Summer of 1969, as part of a larger community organizational program. The students were encouraged to discuss their feelings and attitudes of their problems, of classes, or teachers or interrelational problems. These interviews offer insight into the students reaction to schools of either black majority, white majority or desegregated schools.

Henry, Jules
1963 Culture Against Man New York: Vintage Books.
From the perspective of the anthropologist, Jules Henry looks at school and community and suggests how the two operate to transmit values of the technologically driven culture of the United States today.

Ianni, Francis A. J.
1967 Culture, System and Behavior. Chicago: Science Research Associate
This book deals with the uses and misuses of behavioral science theory and methods in looking at social change for schools.

Jencks, Christopher, and Marsha Brown
1973 The Effects of Desegregation on Student Achievement: Some New Evidence From the Equality of Educational Opportunity Survey. ERIC.
This paper attempts to remedy two limitations of the Coleman report (1965). The results reveal student performance both black and white, in relation to the percentage of whites in a school. The results showed increased gains in relation to national norms in schools that are 25% black, at the elementary level. The percentages had almost no influence on the high school level.

Jessup, Dorothy
1967 School Integration and Minority Group Achievement. *In* The Urban R's: Race Relations as the Problem in Urban Education. Robert A. Dentler, Ed. New York: Praeger.
The article focuses on achievement and self-concept as related to differences in the administration and instructional conditions peculiar to the big-city elementary schools.

Johnson, David
1967 The Effects of a Freedom School on Its Students. *In* The Urban R's: Race Relations as the Problem in Urban Education. Robert A. Dentler, Ed. New York: Praeger.
Johnson analyzes the negative self-appraisals and racial attitudes within schools. He sees the Freedom School as an attempt to change these factors within a program.

Johnson, Guy B.
1956 Racial Integration in Southern Higher Education. Social Forces 34,4:309-12.
This article is based on a survey from 1954, covering areas of the legal background, the enrollment into integrated schools, the social and academic adjustment of Negroes, and the social adjustment of white students. The author attempted to identify the factors in the situation that contributed to an orderly transition from segregation to integration: the Supreme Court decision, the changing social norms of the South, the role of administrators, and the variations in the worlds of white and black people.

Johnson, Norman, J., Neil Gilbert and Robert Wyer
1967 Quality Education and Integration: An Exploratory Study. Phylon 28,3:221-29.
The author proposed that predominantly middle class (Negro) high schools can provide quality education measured by the subsequent performance of their students in college. His study of first term freshman at the University of Ill. showed that Negroes from predominantly black middle class schools did well. Thus he theorized that middle class background and a lack of interracial conflict facilitated educational experience.

Katz, Irwin
1969 Academic Motivation and Equal Educational Opportunity. Equal Educational Opportunity. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Educational Review, Harvard University Press.
The author discusses the theories of

racial differences in the early socialization of academic motivation, analyzing how motivation is developed and reinforced.

1973 Alternatives to a Personality-Deficit Interpretation of Negro Under-Achievement *In* Psychology and Race. Peter Watson, Ed. Aldine Publishing Co.

Katz discussed various theories which attempt to explain the difference in achievement performances of Negro and white children. He related these to variables such as family background, class background, self-confidence, school anxiety, motivation and what can be controlled by the school environment.

Klopf, Gordon and Israel A. Laster

1963 Integrating the Urban School. New York: Columbia University: Teachers College.

This book contains a collection of articles from individuals and agencies concerned with integration in New York City public schools. The goal of the book was to formulate a concept of integration for New York City schools and to make recommendations for policy and processes for schools and agencies.

Knight, James H., Kinnard P. White, and Luther R. Taff

1972 The Effect of School Desegregation, Sex of Student and Socio Economic Staus on the Interpersonal Values of Negro Students. Journal of Negro Education 41, 1:4-11.

The authors researched the effects of school desegregation on the personality development of Negro students, in a southern area, selecting blacks from segregated and desegregated high schools. They attempted to measure the values of: support, conformity, recognition, independence, benevolence, and leadership. Interpersonal values did not vary according to the variable of desegregated/segregated, and the effects of attending a desegregated school were not influenced by either the socioeconomic status of the sex of the student.

Lewis, Ralph and Nancy St. John

1974 Contribution of Cross-Racial Friendship to Minority Group Achievement in Desegregation Classroom. Sociometry 37,1:79-91.

This was a longitudinal test of whether or not growth in achievement for desegregated black pupils is facilitated by acceptence into the majority group peer structure. Tested black sixth graders in Boston test scores partially supported the hypothesis but calls for other sample studies to validate.

Lombardi, Donald N.

1963 Factors affecting Changes in Attitudes Toward Negroes Among High School Students. Journal of Negro Education 32:129-36.

The purpose of the study was to examine the factors affecting changes in attitudes toward Negroes among white students in a school integration situation, using a test-retest experimental design, at two Maryland schools. There seemed to be no significant change in either group after desegregation, with the only change found to be related to the educational level of the mother. Attitude change and decline in scholastic average also showed a direct relationship.

Lunemann, Alan

1973 Desegregation and Achievement: A Cross-Sectional and Semilongitudinal Look at Berkeley, California. Journal of Negro Education 42:429-46.

This report looked at the effects of desegregation on raw score achievement levels of all pupils in Berkeley schools, grades K-3, for a year prior to desegregation and for the first two years following. The author attempted to evaluate the longitudinal effects of a community that desegregated voluntarily.

Mack, Raymond

1968 Our Children's Burden. New York: Vintage Books.

This is a study of desegregation in nine American communities looking at the effects of it on the communities, on the students, and how they comply with the law.

Mastroianni, Mike and Joe Khaterna

1972 Attitudes of Black & White High School Senior Toward Integration. Sociology & Social Research 56,2:221-227

This was a questionaire on interracial attitudes, at integrated and all white schools, to show preference on integration in relation to various social situations. The blacks showed greater awareness of race problems while whites were not sufficiently aware of the prejudice they had for the blacks.

Mayer, Robert and Charles King

1971 A Pilot Study of the Social and Educational Impact of School Desegregation. Research Review 18,2:6-12.

This was an effort to identify the operational difference between a desegregated and an integrated system, looking at the planning process, implementation, educational processes, educational outcomes, interactions, and such. The study was done through observation, interviews and questionaires as part of a longitudinal cohort study of a graduating class.

The whites tested out the same, whereas the blacks showed improvement after desegregation.

Miller, Harry L. and Roger R. Woock

1970 Social Foundations of Urban Education. Hinsdale, Illinois: The Dryden Press, Inc.

The authors assess issues in urban education, focusing on problems and proposed solutions. Research findings from sociology, social psychology and education are used intelligently.

Mills, Nicolaus

1973 The Great School Bus Controversy. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press.

This book includes historical, political and social overviews of the busing controversy, ranging from hard data, to case histories, including views of both sides of the controversy, especially concerning the implications of school busing.

Moore, Alma P.

1970 Education Minus White Prejudice, Plus Black Power Equals Grey Matter. American Personnel and Guidance Assistants.

This is a discussion by the school counselors at New Orleans of the resultant problems their schools faced when the school implemented a desegregation action.

Muir, Donald E.

1963-9 The First Years of Desegregation: Patterns of Acceptance of Black Students on a Deep South Campus. Social Forces 49,3:371-8.

This is a study of attitude changes concerning the acceptance of black students on Deep South Campus, using three surveys conducted during the first three years of desegregation. The author related the attitude change to the increasing liberality of incoming freshman, mass culture, and the media.

Pancoast, Elinor

1956 The Report of a Study on Desegregation in the Baltimore City Schools. Maryland Commission on Interracial Problems and Relations.

This report discussed the special problems and which the public schools in Baltimore encountered in desegregating its schools, such as school problems, the court decision, community opposition, and the constructive gains.

Passow, A. Harry

1963 Education in Depressed Areas. New York: Teachers College Press.

This book presents a collection of articles on problems of urban education.

Pettigrew, Thomas F.

1968 Race and Equal Educational Opportunity. Harvard Educational Review 38,1:66-77.

The author reviewed several studies done prior to Coleman's report, but which supported the findings of the significance of social class on student achievement. He also discusses the weaknesses of these reports: not longitudinal, not corrected for initial achievement level, and the atmospheric difference between desegregated and integrated schools.

1969a Race and Equal Educational Opportunity. Equal Educational Opportunity. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Educational Review, Harvard University Press.

The author points out a need for integration, rather than just desegregation, in order for a difference to be made as far as equality of opportunity.

Pettigrew, Thomas F. and Robert L. Green

1976 School Desegregation in Large Cities: A Critique of the Coleman "White Flight" Thesis. Harvard Educational Review 46,1:1-53.

In this article, James Coleman's research and public statements concerning the relationship between school desegregation and white flight are closely examined. In addition they examine their own study and others whose findings diverge with Coleman's. They offer a critical analysis of his methodology and the failure of Coleman to be able to distinguish between his scientific findings and his personal beliefs. They question many of the underlying assumptions of his conclusions.

Pettigrew, Thomas, F., Marshall Smith, Elizabeth L. Useem, and Clarence Namend

1973 Busing: A Review of the Evidence. The Public Interest 30:88-111.

This is a reanalysis of David Armor's findings in the summer issue of *The Public Interest*, focusing on other conclusions that can be drawn. This article discussed the findings of Armor as well as his underlying assumptions. Their criticisms ranged from that of his methodology, to his biases, and his standards of analyzing the success of desegregation.

Racial Isolation in the Public Schools

1967 Summary of a Report by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. CCR Clearinghouse Publication Number 7. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

The report cites research that suggests that compensatory education is less effective in raising academic achievement of Black students than is desegregation. Possible ways of promoting desegregation while improving education are listed by the Commission as magnet schools and education complexes and parks.

Reagen, M. F.

1974 Five Educational Effects of Busing Students. American School Board Journal 161:44-5.

The article assess the effects of busing on the caliber of education the children receive. It analyzes the findings of research done on busing at the present and concludes that the root of the matter is a need for a fundamental assessment of the presence of higher quality of school services at the end of the bus ride.

Richan, Willard

1967 Racial Isolation In the Cleveland Public Schools. Cleveland Ohio: Case Western Reserve University.

This is a case study of desegregation problems of the Cleveland public schools. It contains the historical background, the extent and type of existing segregation and racial isolation, the community reaction, and a discussion of the costs as a result of attempts to integrate.

Rodgers, Harrell, R. Jr., and Charles S. Bullock

1974 School Desegregation: Successes and Failures. Journal of Negro Education 43:139-54.

The article discusses the merits of integrated school systems in terms of achieving certain goals academic, social race relations and life opportunities. The article evaluated the veracity of some attacks on school desegregation and surveyed the recent school integration studies.

Sachdeva, Darshan

1972 Friendship Among Students in Desegregated Schools. California Journal of Educational Research 23,1.

The author studied the development of friendships among students in desegregated schools, through a set of attitudinal items. The findings suggest that personal contact has been effective in the development of interracial friendships in desegregated schools, in Berkeley, California. The results showed that newly integrated schools develop more interracial friendships, showing that personal contact is effective in reducing racial attitudes.

St. John, Nancy H.

1970 Desegregation and Minority Group Performance. Review of Educational Research 40:111-33.
She reviewed pre-Coleman, Coleman and post-Coleman empirical evidence on the relationship between racial composition of schools and academic achievement of Black children. She points out the weaknesses in the studies, showing the difficulties of researching these areas and in the types of studies performed.

1971 The Elementary Classroom as a Frog Pond: Self-Concept, Sense of Control and Social Context. Social Forces 49:581-95.
This is a reanalysis of the Coleman finding that self-concept falls, but sense of control rises with the percentage of whites in a school. She tested 36 black and white sixth graders and found that achievement contributes the most to self-concept and self control. Academic norms tended to fall as social class level fell. She found that social economic status and achievement are more related to these factors (self-control and self-concept) than is race.

1975 School Desegregation: Outcomes for Children. New York: Wiley.
This book is a critical overview of the findings from over 120 studies on the effects of school racial composition for both black and white students. The author offers a discussion of several experimental design models useful in measuring the effects of school desegergation on children. Both psychological theory and the findings in the research lead St. John to conclude that the outcome of the process would be favorable for the students if the desegregation process were of high quality and had the right mix of personality factors.

Singer, Dorothy

1966 Interracial Attitudes of Negro and White Fifth Grade Children in Segregated and Unsegregated Schools. Unpublished dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.
Her study dealt with three areas concerning attitudes and desegregation: the effect of classroom contact and ethnic attitude, the influence of the variable of intelligence and the desegregation process, and the interracial attitude as a function of sex.

1967a The Influence of Intelligence and an Interracial Classroom on Social Attitudes. *In* The Urban R's: Race Relations as the Problem in Urban Education. Robert A. Dentler, Ed. New York: Praeger.
The author examines the relationship between intergroup relations racial attitudes and individual intelligence. The contributions of intergroup contact, though not uniform, has made a contribution to the social maturation of the child.

1967b Reading, Writing and Race Relations. Trans-Action 4,7:27-31.
These are the results of four studies of fifth grade students testing whether integration of white and black students lead to greater mutual acceptance and what attitudes were influenced by differences in intelligence. The author found that greater exposure lead to greater realism.

Singer, Harry

1970 Effect of Integration on Achievement of Anglos, Blacks and Mexican Americans. Annual Convention of the American Educational Research Association, Minn, Minnesota.
A study of a comparison of pre and post integration, cross-sectional data, from the Riverside Unified School District, California. It was testing the effects of integration on shifts in peer group values, effects on achievement scores. It provided an opportunity to test Coleman's data results.
Singer's results proved that more than physical integration is necessary to improve test scores and possibly psychological and social integration is needed to improve test scores.

Smiley, Marjorie B. and Harry Miller
1968 Policy Issues in Urban Education. New York: The Free Press.
This is a collection of readings dealing with various social and economic problems in relation to specific policy issues, primarily as related to education. These readings reflect the value conflicts inherent in these problems.

Smith, Charles U.
1965 Desegregation on the Negro Student. Speech given at Florida and South Georgia Institute for Superintendents and Board Members on the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Coral Gables, Florida.
This speech emphasized the need to be sensitive to the subculture of the child when entering school. He points out the need to be sensitive to feelings of rejection, social threat, and such as they might effect the scholastic performance for Negro children. He suggests active ways in which administrative and policy makers can reduce prejudice and increase interracial activity.

Smith, Marshall S.
1972 Equality of Educational Opportunity: The Basic Findings Reconsidered. *In* Equality of Educational Opportunity. Frederick Mosteller and Daniel P. Moynihan, Eds. New York. Random House, pp. 230-342.
This study reexamines the five controversial conclusions of the third chapter of the Coleman Report, including criticisms of validity and methodology. Thus he tested the criticisms concerning: methodology, the relationship of student achievement and home background, the relationship of student achievement and student body composition, facilities and curricula characteristics, and the teacher's characteristics. Finally, he summarizes the findings with attention to the policy implications. His reexamination affirms the original conclusions of the report.

Sullivan, Neil V.
1969 Compensation and Integration: The Berkeley Experience. Equal Educational Opportunity. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Educational Review, Harvard Educational Press.
The author examines the failure of Berkeley schools to pull ghetto children up academically through compensatory education.

Taylor, Joseph
1968 Final Report from the Summer Institute on Psychological Sociological Problems of School Desegregation. Bethune-Cookman College, Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare. ERIC.
This is a final report from a six week summer institute for school personnel devoted to improving the understanding of problems accompanying desegregation, changes in race-relations, patterns, and ways to solve psychological and sociological desegregation problems of special interest in the development of aspirations for the Negro youth. The report includes policy recommendations made made by the participants.

Thompson, Daniel C.
1963 Our Wasted Potential. *In* Integrating the Urban School. Gordon Klopf and Israel A. Laster, Eds. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
This article discusses the factors that contributed to the wasted potential of Negro youth. Particularly important is that Thompson pointed out how the schools had attempted to deal with this situation, through desegregation.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
1967 Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, vol. I & II. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
This is a summary of facts and reports concerning issues centered around racial isolation and schools, policies and practices, academic performance and desegregation, racial composition of classes, compensatory programs, and means by which schools are desegregated. Volume II contains a survey given to segregated and desegregated black and white adults who were graduates of Oakland High School, which attempted to analyze the consequences of varied educational experiences. The questions

included analysis of educational aspirations, occupational aspirations, racial attitudes and such. The report was not limited to the affects on blacks, but included information on the effects on whites and their resulting racial attitudes as a consequence.

Watson, Peter, Ed.

1973 Psychology and Race. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.

This represents a social psychological view of race and race relations. It is a collection of articles, written by sociologists and psychologists, on various aspects such as interracial interaction and race in relation to various issues in social psychology.

Webster, Staten W. and Marie N. Kroger

1966 A Comparative Study of Selected Perceptions and Feelings of Negro Adolescents with and without Friends in Integrated Urban High Schools. Journal of Negro Education 35,1:55-61.

The authors studied three types of perceptions of the ways in which black adolescents attending urban high schools do or do not have white friends. They saw this as a function of: personal independence, social competence, intellectual esteem, and total self-concept; higher vocational aspirations and perceptions of potential for later occupational attainment; and a decrease in ethnic concern or anxiety.

Weingerg, Meyer

1965 Research on School Desegregation: Review and Prospect. Chicago, Ill.: Integrated Education Associates.

This is a collection of research results of studies showing the effects of desegregation on student performance, academically and socially, as well as on the teachers and the schools as a whole.

Williams, Robert and Fred Venditti

1969 Effects of Academic Desegregation on Southern White Students' Expressed Satisfaction with School. Journal of Negro Education 38,4:338-41.

This study was to answer the question concerning the effect of desegregation on the white students' satisfaction with school. The study was conducted in schools at all levels of desegregation, in a 'hard core' area of segregation in the south eastern U.S. The findings did not support the fear that desegregation would influence the general satisfaction of white students with desegregation.

Willie, Charles V. and Jerome Baker

1973 Race Mixing in the Public Schools. New York: Praeger Publishers.

The purpose of the study was to discover the patterns of social adjustment of children transferred to other schools. Most of the research was in academic adjustment, for little social research had been done. The report included findings in relation to social adjustment and social economic status. The report also included case study comments from various schools that had been integrated.

Wilson, Alan B.

1969 Social Class and Equal Educational Opportunity. Equal Educational Opportunity. Cambrige, Mass.: Harvard Educational Review, Harvard University Press.

The author examined the effect of student body characteristics on academic achievement, and related it to the Coleman Report.

Yarrow, Marian R., John D. Campbell, and Leon J. Yarrow

1958a Acquisition of New Norms: A Study of Racial Desegregation. Journal of Social Issues 14,1.

This is an analysis of the interpersonal relationship in an imposed desegregation situation at a summer camp. The situation was analyzed according to behavior, social perceptions of the child, group properties, and psycho-dynamic processes. The authors felt two weeks was not long enough for the change, but they felt the situation did provide insight into the reorganization of beliefs and feelings, the emphasizing the role of the situation in defining how a person is to function.

1958b Interpersonal Change: Process and Theory. Journal of Social Issues 14,1.

This is a general discussion of variables involved in changing a social situation

and social relationship, and particularly this camp situation. It concludes with a discussion of theories of interpersonal change.

Young, Robert E.

1974 Interethnic Behavior in Desegregated Secondary Schools. Unpublished dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.

The author explored the problems of interethnic student attitudes and behavior. This includes an overview of the literature on desegregation and a case study of a small urban school system involved in political, inter-racial problems. Young explores the relationship between self-esteem and racial attitudes, and between student social and academic status and their interethnic behavior as based on the social contact theory.

ACCULTURATION, ETHNICITY, AND DESEGREGATION

The topic of desegregation has also been seen as a subset of the literature on culture contact. In this view, desegregation is a process in which sub-culture groups in American society are educated and enculturated in the same, rather than separate, educational settings. The research materials from the 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s, dealing with "acculturation," "assimilation," and the "Americanization" process thus are important background information to the understanding of the process of desegregation. There has, however, always been some debate as to the similarity between the "Americanization" process experienced by the European immigrant and the desegregation process today; socio-cultural, political, economic, and even communications contexts are quite different today. The research literature which developed in studying the processes of culture contact does, however, provide a valuable background for understanding desegregation as a socio-cultural process.

Acculturation studies were very common during the period of European immigration and focused on how minority groups adapted the cultures they brought with them to the American culture they found here. The concept of acculturation was largely used by American anthropologists to describe the results of borrowing when two groups come into sustained culture contact. While there was some sociological use of the term,[1] most sociologists used the concept "assimilation" as defined by Park to mean what most anthropologists called "acculturation."[2] British anthropologists, who made many studies of this type in Africa and Oceania, use the term "culture contact" in much the same way as acculturation or assimilation was used in this country. The history of the term has, then, been largely American, although one study reports a German use of the word.[3]

Acculturation studies became popular among American anthropologists after the first World War, although some field studies among Indian tribes preceded this period.[4] During the post-war period the "Americanization" movement lent a new interest to the processes by which immigrants acquire new cultural responses.[5] The development of this field continued into the late 1920s and early 1930s with increasing emphasis on the study of immigrant groups as well as the effects of European-American civilization on the American Indian. In 1935 the Social Science Research Council set up a sub-committee for the study of acculturation composed of Ralph Linton, Robert Redfield and Melville J. Herskovits. Its purpose was to define the concept of acculturation and to prepare a statement concerning how acculturation should be studied. In 1936 it published a "Memorandum for the Study of Acculturation" which defined the concept as quoted previously. To their definition they added that:

> . . . acculturation is to be distinguished from *culture change*, of which it is but one aspect, and *assimilation*, which is at times a phase of acculturation. It is also to be differentiated from diffusion, which, while occurring in all instances of acculturation, is not only a phenomenon which frequently takes place without the occurrence of the types of contact between peoples specified in the definition given above, but also constitutes only one aspect of the process of acculturation. (Herskovits 1938:10)

The committee went on to discuss the approach to be used in studies of this type and to analyze the contact situations in which acculturation might be found. It also discussed the possible psychological reactions of individuals undergoing the process. In terms of the acceptance of traits by the groups involved they listed three possible results of acculturation:

> A. *Acceptance*: where the process of acculturation eventuates in the taking over of the greater portion of another culture and the loss of the older cultural heritage; with acquiescence on the part of the accepting group, and, as a result, assimilation by them not only to the behavior patterns but to the inner values of the culture with which they have come into contact.
>
> B. *Adaptation*: where both original and foreign traits are combined so as to produce a smoothly functioning cultural whole which is actually an historic mosaic; with either the reworking of the patterns of the two cultures into a harmonious meaningful whole to the individuals concerned, or the retention of a series of more or less conflicting attitudes and points of view which are reconciled in everyday life as specific occasions arise.
>
> C. *Reaction*:: where because of oppression, or because of the unforeseen results of the acceptance of foreign traits, contra-acculturative movements arise; these maintaining their psychological force (a) as compensations for an imposed or assumed inferiority, or (b) through the prestige which a return to older preacculturative conditions may bring to those participating in such a movement. (Herskovits 1938: 135-136)

It is interesting to note that these results are very similar to those found in a field investigation study among the Italians of New Haven, Connecticut, conducted by a psychologist interested in discerning the reactions of second generation males to the acculturative process (Child: 1942). In addition, some studies of desegregation, to be discussed in a later section, have found similar patterns among black children assigned to previously all white schools.

Melville Herskovits' volume on acculturation (1938) traced the development of the concept from a loosely used and ambiguous term to the concise definition of the Social Science Research Council sub-committee; he also reviewed much of the field work previously done by anthropologists. In his review of field work there is no mention of investigations involving immigrants to this country due to the author's neglect or sociological work; also most of the work in this area had been theoretical rather than empirical research up to the time of his publication.

Ralph Linton's *Acculturation in Seven American Indian Tribes* was the next work to appear (1940). In this work separate authorities present the effects of the contact history of seven tribes. In terminal chapters Linton reviews the factual date and offers certain interpretive generalizations. He discusses what he terms "directed culture change," in which one group in the contact situation interferes actively with the culture of the other. As an example he cites the case of the Spaniards in Mexico compelling the Indians to attend Christian rites and give up their pagan rites, noting that this situation can occur only where there is a contact situation involving dominance and submission. This point is an important one for the study of desegregation when definite action and purposive policy by the dominant social group to influence change is characteristic. Another point made by Linton concerns the predominant direction of the flow of cultural traits in the case of immigrant "Old Stock" contact in America:

> Then the socially superior group also has the culture which is best adapted to the local conditions, the onesidedness of the borrowing reaches a maximum. This condition is well illustrated by European immigrant groups in America. Most of these groups have, in the process of their absorption, taken over the pre-existing American culture almost as a whole, giving only a few minor elements of culture in return. (1940:512)

In 1941 an entire issue of the *American Anthropologist* was devoted to the subject of acculturation, the result of a symposium comprising a theoretical orientation by M. J.

Herskovits followed by reports of field work by various investigators. Herskovits, reexamining the 1938 definition of acculturation, adds several new points. In discussing the value of documentary history dating to early times Herskovits states:

> . . . the cultural baseline from which a particular change took its beginning—a phrasing somewhat to be preferred to that of 'zero-point'—cannot be ignored. This must be constituted as completely as possible if the hybrid culture actually observed by the student is to be correctly interpreted, and the theoretical derivaties of research adequately exploited. It goes without saying that where documents are available they must be utilized to the fullest degree; but where they are not to be had . . . reconstruction by other methods, such as the questioning of elderly folk who have had pre-contact experience, is essential. Only by such a procedure can the tendencies to change inherent in the precontact patterns of a society—its 'cultural drift'—be recovered, analyzed, and, in a manner historically valid, balanced against the resistances and acceptances that have actually resulted from the acculturative experience. (Herskovits 1941:4)

To this should be added the necessity of an examination of these members of an immigrant group, for example, who remained in the homeland, thus enabling the investigator to observe those changes which would have taken place had the observed group not emigrated. Most acculturation studies of European immigrants to the United States ignored the reality of social change in Europe—culture change being attributed to acculturative forces if found to have taken place, regardless of the facts of worldwide or nation-wide changes (Ianni 1958).

A further modification of the earlier definition concerns:

> . . . the criterion of 'continuous first-hand contact' between 'groups of individuals having different cultures.' Difficulties in the way of delimiting this situation with any degree of accuracy have been pointed out, as, for example, where the question has been raised whether these terms cover changes in the culture of a Pacific island folk that result from 'the visit of the mission boat once or twice a year; and the work of a single missionary.' (1941:6)

Herskovits then goes on to point out Linton's comment that this visit by the mission boat is neither first-hand nor continuous. Linton's contention (1940:464) that these situations can not be considered to fall within the framework of acculturation studies since the criteria of "continuous" and "first-hand" are not met is countered by the citation of a study by Greenberg (1941:51-61) conducted among the Hausa which depicts a situation in which there is no physical contact and the agency of acculturation was Moslem literature transmitted throughout the general population by a small literate minority. Herskovits concludes:

> Thus while continuous contact may be held as a valid term, the element of diffusion at first hand through contact between entire peoples must be revised. (1941:7)

This case cited by Herskovits is a special one and while it is entirely possible for elements of a culture to be transferred through media other than personal contact, the criterion of "first hand contact" is a valid one since destroying it would lead to confusion between the concepts of acculturation and diffusion. Similarly, desegregation should be viewed as a social process which also requires continuous, first hand contact.

The interest in acculturation studies continued and, indeed, increased for a short time after the second World War. This was especially true of immigrant-group studies in the United States and the psychological aspects of acculturation. In this latter field of acculturation theory, contributions have been made by psychologically oriented anthropologists as well as professional psychologists. A. Irving Hallowell, for example, in his discussion of the sociopsychological aspects of acculturation, pointed out that studies of culture contact often give the impression that "cultures meet" while actually such a situation does not exist. What is meant, according to Hallowell, is that peoples meet and through the social interaction which we refer to as acculturation, modifications in the way of life of one of the contacting peoples may take place. He goes on to point out that individuals within the contacting groups are at the center of this interaction process and where perceptible differences have come about it is the individual who has learned the new ways of thinking or acting (Hallowell 1945:174-176).

In the early 1950s, the study of acculturation began to decline except for some specialized interest in the study of second-generation off-spring of immigrants or the characteristics of ethnic communities in American cities (Whyte, W. F. 1955; Gans 1962).

By the late 1950s and 1960s the influence of the Civil Rights movement in education led to some reawakening of interest in culture contact, particularly in such areas as "multi-cultural," "bi-cultural" and "bi-lingual" education programs. In addition, concern with cultural bias in psychometric testing focused concern on cultural influences on culture contact. Now, however, the emphasis has shifted from culture to power—economic, political, and social—and ethnicity took on a new meaning. In the Americanization period, European immigrants accepted the requirement of accepting American culture as the basis for social mobility. The new "minorities"—blacks, Hispanics, and American Indians—held that they should be able to maintain their cultural identity as ethnic groups and still demand a share of economic, political and educational power.

In the 1960s and 1970s the term *ethnicity* emerged as a generic concept which has served to organize a growing area of research interest. First mentioned as such by Riseman in 1953 (Glazer and Moynihan 1975:1) it has become a topic of much discussion. Tumin has defined ethnicity as "a social group which, within a larger cultural and social system, claims or is accorded special status in terms of a complex of traits (ethnic traits) which it exhibits or is believed to exhibit" (Tumin 1964). Glazer and Moynihan (1975:4) note that this has been broadened in general usage to include subgroups, minorities, and "to all the groups of a society characterized by a distinct sense of difference owing to culture and descent." Indeed, they go on to note that these ideas are not remnants from an earlier age but that ethnicity represents a "form of social life that is capable of renewal and transformation" (Glazer and Moynihan 1975:4). Despite the emphasis on culture in the definition of ethnicity, there is often a sense that it somehow differs from earlier notions of sub-culture:

> Something new has appeared .... The phenomenon is too new. We feel that to see only what is familiar in the ethnicity of our time is to miss the emergence of a new social category as significant for the understanding of the present-day world as that of social class itself. For in the welter of contemporary forms of group expression and group conflict there is both something new and something common: there has been a pronounced and sudden increase in tendencies by people in many countries and in many circumstances to insist on the significance of their group distinctive and identity and the new rights that derive from this group character. (Glazer and Moynihan 1975:2-3)

This groupness will be an increasingly important factor in understanding modern society and influences all social processes involving ethnic relations. It relates most clearly to school desegregation in the literature on ethnic stratification.

While many forms of stratification exist here and elsewhere, Noel (1968) argues that an essential form in American society is that of ethnic stratification: "a system of stratification wherein some relatively fixed group membership (e.g., race, religion, or nationality) is utilized as a major criterion for assigning social positions with their attendant differential rewards" (1968:157).

An important element of ethnic stratification as it was in acculturation studies is ethnocentrism. A number of studies have explored the functions and dysfunctions of ethnocentrism. Catton and Hung define ethnocentrism as "the tendency of group members to judge other cultures by the standards of judgment prevailing in their own culture" (1960:203). They go on to indicate that departure from these norms is viewed as deviant behavior.

While ethnocentrism, as a basis for ethnic stratification has obvious benefits for maintaining the established order of the dominant ethnic group, it is at the same time dysfunctional to the minority group. Elsewhere, Catton, following Sumner, argues, that ethnocentrism, while valuable for the in-group, majority or minority, "entails measurable costs in intergroup relations" (Catton and Hung 1962:191). With a somewhat different orientation, Rosen has presented evidence to show that "the disparity between the vertical mobility rates of some racial and ethnic groups can, in part, be explained as a function of their dissimilar psychological and cultural orientations towards achievement" (Rosen 1959:47).

The concept of ethnicity has been historically the province of sociologists, but as Depres observes, anthropologists are increasingly moving into this area (Depres 1975:188). Barth has argued that the persistence of ethnic groups has been ignored by social anthropologists and explores the implications for the boundaries between groups. He goes on to note that by "concentrating on what is *socially* effective, ethnic groups are seen as a form of social organization" (Barth 1969:13). In this light a boundary "defines the group, not the cultural stuff that it encloses" (Barth 1969:15).

More recently the Ninth International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences issued a volume entitled *Ethnicity and Resource Competition in Plural Societies* (Despres 1975). Noting that Barth is concerned with ethnicity in terms of the "subjective process of status identification" (Despres 1975:190), authors of this volume present what they call an objective viewpoint and what it has to offer. The objective viewpoint is based on a concern for culture. They note, though:

> All of these papers are inclined to take issue with the subjectivist conception of ethnicity which is thought to derive from the work of Barth. . . . An exclusively objectivist, or cultural, conception of ethnicity is equally unserviceable. This makes theoretically problematic not only the relationship between cultural distributions and categorical ethnic ascriptions but also the role and overall significance of the subjective element in respect to such ascriptions. (Despres 1975:191)

With the previously mentioned concept of ethnic stratification in mind, Despres goes on to argue:

> If ethnicity is viewed as one form of social stratification, it needs to be emphasized that social class is quite another. Ethnic stratifications derive their structural futures from categorical status ascriptions. By way of contrast, class stratifications are more evidently based upon status identities which are achieved. In theory these two forms of stratification exist in contradiction. In fact, they may co-exist in complex ways according to the historical, techno-environmental, economic and political parameters of particular societies in which they are found. (Despres 1975:193)

It will later be argued that what he is saying has important implications for classroom observation in desegregated settings. In this same vein, we feel it is necessary to quote one more passage from Despres:

> It also emerges from these papers that not all categorical identities are ethnic; and related to this is the fact that ethnic identities are rarely inclusive of the full range of social identities structured into poly-ethnic societies. Thus, from a social organizational point of view, ethnic identities may vary according to the variety of social situations in which they may be appropriately expressed. It follows from this that individuals need not play ethnic roles all of the time in order that poly-ethnic systems persist; that the ethnic identities ascribed to population aggregates do not make of those aggregates corporately or politically organized groups; and that corporately organized ethnic groups need not be the only politically important groups to which individuals might belong in a poly-ethnic society. And it follows from all of this that the behavioral significance of ethnicity, for individuals as well as for the groups they form, cannot be ascertained apart from a rather comprehensive analysis of the overall social system. (Despres 1975:193)

The above discussion has direct implications for both micro-level and macro-level research. If one is interested in interethnic situations such as desegregated schools, then one should be considerate of what Barth as well as the objectivists cited earlier have written. A dual level of analysis is called for. For example, Holloman observes in her study of the Cuna:

> At the macro-level the stability of the interethnic boundary is reflective of the way in which the Cuna and non-Cuna have arrived at de facto patterns of access (or lack of them) to political and economic resources. At the micro-level, the Cuna side of that boundary is sustained by internal structures, which simultaneously guarantee rewards adequate to sustained member support of the ethnic system and provide for control of change-related deviant behavior. (Holloman 1975:38)

We submit that if "black" is substituted for "Cuna" and "non-black" for "non-Cuna," then ramifications of these same boundaries can be observed in the desegregated classroom. We suggest that the discovery of this process will shed new light on the problem of classroom desegregation.

Notes

[1] See, for example, C. Dawson and W. Gettys, *Introduction to Sociology*, 1948, p. 304; E. E. Eubank, *Concepts of Sociology*, 1932, pp. 371-372; L. Wilson and W. Kolb, *Sociological Analysis*, 1949, p. 686.

[2] Park's definition of assimilation is: "the name given to the process by which people of diverse racial orgins and different cultural heritages, occupying a common territory achieve a solidarity sufficient at least to achieve a national unity." R. K. Park, "Assimilation, Social," *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, 1930, v. II, 281-283. See also R. E. Park and E. W. Burgess, *An Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, 1921, p. 735: "a process of interpenetration and fusion in which persons and groups acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes of other persons or groups, and, by sharing their experience and history, are incorporated with them in a common cultural life." For a critique of the use of the concept "assimilation" see N. Whetten and A. Green, "Field Research and the Concept of Assimilation," *Rural Sociology*, 1942, v. VII, No. 3, pp. 252-260. More recently see M. Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life*, 1964.

[3] Herskovits cites the use of the words *Akkulturationagebieten* (areas of acculturation) and *Akkulturationaverhaltnis* (acculturational relationships) by Ehrenreich in 1905 in a study of South American Mythology. Mr. Herskovits, *Acculturation*, 1938, pp. 4-5

[4] See, for example, P. Radin, "The Influence of the Whites on Winnebago Culture," *Proceedings of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin*, 1913, pp. 137-145, or his "A Sketch of the Peyote Cult of the Winnebago: A Study in Borrowing," *Journal of Religious Psychology*, v. XII, 1914, pp. 1-22.

[5] B. S. Bogardus, *Essentials of Americanization*, 1919; R. Park and H. A. Miller, *Old World Traits Transplanted*, 1921; W. I. Thomas and F. Znaniecki, *The Polish Peasant in Europe and American*, 1918-1921.

References Cited

Barth, Frederick, Ed.

1969 Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Differences. London: George Allen & Union.

Using a social anthropological perspective, the author applies this to the problems of ethnic groups and their persistence. Particular attention should be paid to the notion of boundaries.

Catton, William R. and Sung Chick Hong

1960-1961 The Functions and Dysfunctions of Ethnocentrism: A Theory. Social Problems 8, 3:201-211.

In a theoretical exploration of the theory of ethnocentrism, the author assesses the functions and dysfunctions of this concept. A formalized theory is presented. Implications for in-groups and outgroups are discussed.

Child, Irving

1942 Italian or American? New Haven: Yale University Press.

An early study of the Italian-Americans with implications for acculturation explored.

Despres, Leo A.

1975 Toward a Theory of Ethnic Phenomena. *In* Ethnicity and Resource Competition in Plural Socities. Leo Despres, Ed. Paris: Mouton Publishers, pp. 187-208.

A discussion of the subjectivist and objectivist orientations in the study of ethnic group theory.

Gans, H.

1962 The Urban Villagers. New York: The Free Press.

This book is a participant-observation study of native-born Americans of Italian parentage in Boston's West End. The author states that he wanted to study the assumption that slum life is a form of deviance.

Glazer, N. and Daniel P. Moynihan, Eds.
1975 Ethnicity: Theory and Experience. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
This volume is a collection of essays dealing with the topic of ethnicity in various cultures. Of particular interest should be the first section entitled "Toward a General Theory" which contains essays by Isaacs, Parsons, Gordon, Horowitz, and Bell. The introduction to this volume contains an essay by the editors tracing the history of ethnicity and an assessment of current trends.

Greenberg, J. H.
1941 Some Aspects of Negro-Mohammendan Culture Contact Among the Hausa. American Anthropologist LVIII, 1:51-61.
The author presents evidence which challenges the notion that "first hand" contact is necessary for acculturation to take place.

Hallowell, A. I.
1945 Sociopsychological Aspects of Acculturation. *In* The Science of Man in World Crisis. R. Linton, Ed., pp. 174-200.
In a discussion of acculturation and its sociopsychological aspects, the author notes that "man's life is a continual adaptation and readaptation through cultural instrumentalities." It is the nature of this constant change that is the topic of this essay.

Herskovits, Melville
1938 Acculturation: The Study of Culture Contact. Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith.
This book represents a major classical statement on acculturation in anthropolocy. Included in the end is the Herskovits, Redfield, Linton, outline for the study of acculturation.

Holloman, Regina E.
1975 Ethnic Boundary Maintenance, Readaptation, and Societal Evolution in the San Blas Islands of Panama. *In* Ethnicity and Resource Competition in Plural Societies. Leo Despres, Ed. Paris: Mouton Publishers, pp. 27-40.
The author relates the notion of resource competition to boundary maintenance among the San Blas Cuna of Panama.

Ianni, Francis A. J.
1958 Time and Place as Variables in Acculturation Research. American Anthropologist XIV.
An exploration of social change as it affects European immigrants.

Linton, Ralph, Ed.
1940 Acculturation in Seven American Indian Tribes.
This book presents information concerning acculturation in American Indian Tribes. At the time of publication it contained new and unpublished work. It also contains an early outline in the acculturation process.

Noel, Donald L.
1968 A Theory of the Origin of Ethnic Stratification. Social Problems 16, 2:157-172.
Noel uses the concepts of ethnocentrism, competition, and differential power for constructing a theory of ethnic stratification. The theory is tested by applying these ideas to the emergence of slavery in America in the seventeenth century.

Rosen, Barnard
1959 Race, Ethnicity, and Achievement. American Sociological Review 24, 1.
Rosen explores the functions of achievement motivation, achievement values, and educational-occupational aspirations on social mobility for ethnic and racial groups in the United States.

Sexton, Patricia C.
1967 The American School. A Sociological Analysis. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
The author studies the American school in its social context. She explores the economic and political structures that have shaped American education and also educational influence on American culture and society.

Strom, Robert D.
1965 Teaching in the Slum School. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc.
The purpose of this book is to prepare teachers for the deplorable conditions

they will encounter in ghetto schools—rebellious students coming from broken homes, in communities beset by crime, poor housing and street life, and with child management, not education, taking place in urban classrooms.

Tumin, Melvin
1964 Ethnicity. *In* Dictionary of the Social Sciences. Julius Gould and William L. Kolb, Eds, New York: The Free Press of Glencoe-Macmillan.
A definition of the term ethnicity.

Whyte, W. F.
1955 Street Corner Society. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
This is a study of an Italian slum which focuses on their forms of social organization with reference to systems of power and subordination among the residents.

Wolcott, Harry F.
1975 Ethnographic Approaches to Research in Education. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Anthropology Curriculum Project.
An extensive bibliography on the application of the ethnographic method to educational research.

Additional Readings

Crow, Lester D., Walter Murray and Hugh Smythe
1966 Educating the Culturally Deprived Child. New York: David McKay Company, Inc.
Crow et al. lead off with a discussion of the lives of the disadvantaged, marked by unemployment, poor housing, living on welfare, poor education and attitudes of hopelessness. This book demonstrates vividly what is wrong with the concept of the culturally deprived child.

Gottlieb, David
1964 Teaching and Students: The Views of Negro and White Teachers. Sociology of Education 37:345-353.
How do teachers in de facto segregated ghetto schools feel about their jobs and the black students they teach? Gottlieb surveyed 89 elementary school teachers, 53 white and 36 black, teaching in a medium sized industrial community in the Midwest. The teachers were employed in six inner city schools having a majority of students who were low-income black. The survey found job satisfaction highest for young black teachers, with job dissatisfaction increasing with the respondent's age for both black and white teachers. Reasons for job dissatisfaction were divided, with black teachers naming inadequate facilities, over-crowding and lack of supplies, and white teachers tending to cite student behavior-discipline problems and lack of parental interest in the schools. White teachers characterized their students as talkative, lazy, fun loving, high strung and rebellious (Gottlieb's categories). Black teachers, on the other hand, called the students fun loving, happy, cooperative, energetic and ambitious. There's not much in this article but it's nice to know 10 years ago there were so many fun-loving blacks.

Hickerson, Nathaniel
1966 Education for Alienation. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
The author contends the values taught formally and informally in American schools destroy most children's motivation to learn. He describes the damaging effects of imposing middle class values on ghetto school children.

Leacock, Eleanor Burke
1969 Teaching and Learning in City Schools. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
This book reports on the author's comparative anthropological study of four urban elementary schools. The study focuses on the classroom experiences of city children. Both obvious and intentional forms of socialization, such as the daily routine pledging of the flag and unconscious forms of socialization, such as lowered job expectations for poor black children are discussed. The author explores some implications of this education in social values for the children's intellectual development. The emphasis is not on the individual child's progress as measured by psychological and achievement testing, but on teacher-child and child-child interactions in the group.

THE LABELING PERSPECTIVE AND DESEGREGATION

The labeling perspective is a useful device for identifying cultural processes that do not adapt themselves to the accepted behavior codes of the dominant group. The extent to which such behavior is discernable presupposes deviance from those acceptable patterns of behavior. The nature of this "deviance" can then be explored in terms of the cultural milieu from which the individual comes. While the labeling perspective, sometimes referred to as labeling theory, originated in the study of deviance and criminal behavior, a small but growing body of literature does exist that applies this theoretical perspective to schools.

It should be noted at this point that for the study of segregation in schools we are concerned with two different processes of labeling: those labels, usually deviant in nature, that originate in the organizational structure of the schools and those that are applied by society at large such as ethnic stereotypes. The implications of all this for the functioning of the schools as they undergo desegregation is an obvious if unattended area of research interest, particularly as it relates to classrooms.

In *The Educational Decision-Makers,* Cicourel and Kitsuse studied a high school in an upper income community and investigated the processes by which the persons came to be defined, classified and recorded in the categories of the high school's records. Attention was directed to the definitions applied and procedures followed by the personnel whereby students were differentiated, labeled, and processed as "college material," "academic problems," "troublemakers," etc. The use of such definitions and their effects upon the interpretation of student behavior by the organizational personnel became the primary source of data for understanding how students came to be classified and distributed among the various categories of the high school's records. A significant point made in the study is that the high school as a socially organized system of activities differentiates talented from average and low-ability students and college-going from non-college going students and these activities may affect the future occupational careers of the student population.

Cicourel and Kitsuse also found that ability grouping is significantly related to the distribution of educational opportunities among the student population and that the school serves as a clearing house for other community agencies that come into contact with the adolescent. The school, therefore, occupies a strategic position in the organization and control of the adolescent's status position. The authors conclude that the day-to-day activities of school personnel effectively control the access of students to the limited number of curriculums available, particularly those most instrumental for upward mobility, i.e., the college preparatory curriculum. Their case study findings support the view that "the student's progress in the sequence of transitions is contingent upon the interpretations, judgements, and action of school personnel vis-a-vis the student's biography, social class and "social type," as well as his demonstrated ability and performance" (1962:136-7).

Reflecting upon their approach the researchers share the following thoughts on the differentiation process in the school:

> The consequences of social typing for differential interpretation and treatment of the behavior of individuals so typed are commonplace and quite obvious. What is not so obvious, and the central concern of this paper, are the interpretive rules utilized by the organizational personnel who decide what forms of behavior and what kinds of evidence warrant actions which define individuals as deviant within the system. . . . In any investigation of how 'deviant' and 'non-deviant' populations are differentiated within a system, the rules of interpretation employed for evaluating the behavior elements observed and classified in the day-to-day activities of the personnel must systematically be taken into account. (as cited in Hargreaves 1975:19)

More recently, in a British approach to the labeling perspective as applied to classrooms, Hargreaves and his associates found the following variables important to typing students: "appearance, conformity to discipline role aspects, conformity to academic role aspects, likeability, and peer group relations" (1975:147-148).

These authors proceed to use their results to develop a theory of typing:

> The theory proposes that pupils are typed or formulated by teachers in three stages. The first stage, that of 'speculation,' begins when the teacher first comes to know about and/or to meet the pupil for the first time. The third stage, that of 'stabilization,' marks the point at which the teacher has a relatively clear and stable conception of the identity of the pupils. He 'knows' the pupil; he understands him; he finds little difficulty in making sense of his acts and is not puzzled or surprised by what he does or says. The second stage, that of 'elaboration,' stands between the other two stages. . . . These stages should not be regarded as highly discrete or distinct stages that can easily be distinguished. Although the stages do occur in a sequence, they do not refer to distinctive periods of time. A stage is characterized by certain problems and processes. The stages fuse into each other, both in the sense that they can overlap in time and in the sense that processes from different stages can and do occur at the same point in time. (1975:145)

This is one of the most formalized statements relating the labeling approach to classroom processes. Yet, if one were to test these stages in a school being desegregated, attention must be called to the fact that these stages may be greatly influenced by cultural factors in the social milieu from which the teacher and the student come. Indeed, from his own research of stigma in schools Fisher (1972) argues that the emphasis for labeling theorists to study the "developmental course represents an over-emphasis on external coercion and an under-emphasis or choice and opportunity" (1972: Considering that the whole issue of school desegregation came about through the courts mandating equal opportunity, we suggest that the study of labels may have ramifications on a more macro of societal level.

More recently, Ianni and his associates at the Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute have used the term "sorting" in much the way labeling is used here. In studying the social organization of a multi-racial urban inner city high school, they have found that students are sorted into perspective groupings largely by racial or ethnic identification. Chinese students, for example, are perceived as bright, studious and academically oriented, while black students are perceived generically as poor students lacking motivation and ability. In comparison studies in a rural and a suburban high school, both ethnically homogenous, they found that sorting exists there also but around different, non-ethnic dimensions (Calhoun, 1973).

To begin to determine the applicability of the labeling perspective to ethnic groups in educational settings, some evidence can be gleaned from Jane Mercer's (1973) study on the prevalence of mental retardation in the elementary schools of Riverdale, California. It was found that many minority parents from lower socio-economic levels are not likely to perceive their children as mentally retarded during the pre-school years and do not refer them to a clinician while Anglo parents are more likely to make a referral. After being in school, children acquire other statuses. "Mental retardate" may be acquired as well as other differentiation within the classroom such as "talented," "average," or "slow." Students who perform in an exemplary manner are assigned to valued groups and those who fail receive punishment through assignment to devaluated groups.

More Mexican-American and black children were recommended for placement and ultimately placed in classes for the mentally retarded. The ethnic disparities are revealing. Anglocentrism in labeling the mentally retarded was found in the public schools and is clearly linked with the statistical definition of "normal" and the I.Q. test. According to Mercer, "Anglocentrism is a form of ethnocentrism in American society. Historically, Anglocentrism has relegated Non-Anglos to marginal social statuses" (Mercer 1973:121). Later using socio-culturally oriented techniques, she found disproportionately large numbers of children who were reclassified as quasi-retarded and normal rather than mentally retarded were Mexican-American and black.

The usefulness of labeling for the study of ethnic background and classroom processes emerges clearly in Rosenfeld's study of the failure of an elementary school in Harlem in "*Shut Those Thick Lips!*" In a chapter whose title itself has labeling implications—"White Lies About Black Children"—Rosenfeld makes the following observation on teacher expectations and student reactions:

> Still another myth about the children was that "they were unwilling to change" and "were of little worth as they were." This attitude is partly in keeping with the dominant American value that one must strive to better himself constantly; one cannot stand still, so to speak. Status is to be achieved by continual efforts to improve. Pedagogically this implied that the child could not be worked with as he was; he was not sufficiently ready for learning. Thus, if the teacher failed, it was because the child offered insufficient material with which to work. However, the greater the push to alter who children were, the greater was their resistance to change. (1971:56)

Note that according to Rosenfeld, failure and the cultural milieu of the school in the desegregated setting are closely related:

> This fact is extremely important to realize: the failure of children at Harlem School is also the failure of the teachers, just as individual success may be related to teachers' efforts. Culture is a group phenomenon and even individual expressions of it are the result of group influences. If the child slips back in his educational achievement, it is likely that a cultural shove was provided in that direction. Learning not to learn is just as effective as learning to learn.
>
> It was my own view that too much attention was likely paid to the "emotional" condition of children who did not achieve rather than to the social and cultural factors influencing the learning situation. I had realized early in my experience that children have different learning styles. Until now "little careful analysis is given how the child's learning might improve simply by concentrating on the way he works and learns, rather than on his affective reasons for not learning" (Riesman, 1964:51). And equal attention has to be paid to the differences in teaching styles. Learning style and teaching style combine through the medium of subject matter—in a specific cultural context—to effect educational transmission. (1971:39)

This notion of culture as a group phenomenon is an important one for it tells us something about the link Despres was looking for between macro and micro levels of analysis. It also reminds us that school desegregation involves all these levels. On the other hand, due process, as was noted earlier in the review of court decisions, was more than mere structural outcomes. As Singleton argues, education can be defined as cultural transmission (1974:26). If this definition is to be accepted, then what goes on in the classroom of the desegregated school can be seen as cultural conflict. Once again we quote Rosenfeld:

> The education of children has been seen for too long as an intuitive process. Thus, when intuition fails, there is the tendency to label children as non-conforming, disruptive, and outside the mold we have artifically created for them. Yet one wonders if outspoken children do not keep alive for us the hope that we must alter our views and thereby assign new meaning and purpose to the transmission of culture in our schools. Their restlessness preserves for us the chance to overcome our centripetal attitudes about their capabilities for learning. As long as the pot boils someone has to look after it. The examination of Harlem School has revealed that the requirements for being a student were much more stringent than were the requirements for being a teacher. And the penalties for failure in the student role were much more harsh and longer lasting than the penalties for failing to teach. The teacher-learner relationship was not reciprocal; rather, it placed an altogether incommensurable burden on the child. It placed him at a disadvantage in the strivings toward reasonable life chances. Problems unsurmounted in the classroom made for compounded problems in later years, diminishing the skills with which his education purportedly prepared him. (1971:94)

Before leaving our discussion of the labeling perspective, it should be noted that Becker (1973) has argued that the term labeling be dropped. Instead, one should think in terms of "interactionist theory" which he says looks at the people involved in any episode of alleged deviance. When we assume an interactionist perspective, we feel that the activities require overt or tacit cooperation of many people and groups to occur as they do. Deviance then, can be seen as collective action and is reflected in people's action from the standpoint of their being concerned with the way their fellows will evaluate what they do and how this evaluation will affect their prestige and rank. He further suggests that interactionist theory can focus on some relatively unstudied participants involved in the episode who are powerful enough to make their charges of deviance stick: police, courts, parents, school officials and physicians. What is significant here is that Becker asserts that when one party to a relationship is disproportionately powerful, they are able to enforce their will over others' objectives while maintaining the appearance of justice and rationality. The less powerful occupy a subordinate status that is comparable to the interactions in parent-child, teacher-student, and welfare worker-client relationships. Becker stresses that superordinate groups are moral entrepreneurs who exert control over the less fortunate by manipulation of definitions and labels which work smoothly and cost less. This insight has far-reaching implications for education and the study of desegregation within the framework of the school and the community. It is clear, as Becker points out, that the study of people with power is necessary to detect forms of labeling and means by which labeling achieves the status of being "normal" and "legitimate."

While research on school desegregation has not been a major concern of the labeling perspective, there are several related concepts that have implications for school desegregation processes in the classroom: the notion of role-sets (Merton 1957; McPherson 1972), reference groups (Shibutanni 1955), self-concept (Rist 1970; Rosenthal and Jackson 1968; Snyder 1966), and the presentation of the self (Goffman 1959; Goffman 1963).

REFERENCES CITED

Becker, Howard
1973 The Outsiders. New York: Free Press.
Asserts that interactionist theorists insist that we look at all the people involved in any episode of alleged deviance, because we do find that activities require overt or tacit cooperation of many people and groups to occur as they do.

Calhoun, Craig Jackson
1974 General Status: Specific Role. *In* Council on Anthropology and Education Quarterly 5:2
Discussion of the implication of a given status and its associated roles within a formal organization. Examples of high school organizational behavior are discussed.

Cicourel, Aaron and John Kitsuse
1963 The Educational Decision Makers. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc.
The authors studied an upper income community and investigated the process by which persons came to be defined, classified and recorded in the categories of the administrative organization (high school's) statistics.

Fisher, Sethard
1972 Stigma and Deviant Careers in School. Social Problems 001.20:1.
In a study of 7th, 8th, and 9th grade students, the researcher tests the claims of the labeling approach to deviance. Findings were not entirely consistent with the claims.

Goffman, Erving
1959 The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. New York: Doubleday.
The author develops the theory of the dramaturgical perspective toward viewing interaction among persons and roles. The section on presentation maps has implications for classroom studies of desegregation.

Goffman, Erving
1963 Stigma. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

As the subtitle suggests, Goffman explores the management of spoiled identity. Various types of stigmas are discussed. Possible applications exist for the study of ethnic groups.

Hargreaves, David H., Stephen Hester and Frank Mellor
1975 Deviance in Classrooms. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
In an application of the labeling perspective to the study of classroom processes, the authors develop a theory of typing. This is the most extensive application of this theoretical perspective to schools to date.

Mercer, Jane R.
1973 Labeling the Mentally Retarded. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
A field survey and an agency survey for the Riverside, California research project are the basis of a two-pronged design for studying the epidemiology of retardation from a clinical as well as social system perspective.

Merton, Robert K.
1957 Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe: The Free Press.
This is the second edition of Merton's classic work on structural-functional theory in sociology. Developed in this volume are the concepts of status set and role set.

McPherson, Gertrude H.
1972 Small Town Teacher. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
McPherson applies her observations as a elementary school teacher to Merton's concept of role-set. The various roles a teacher performs in her daily tasks are described.

Rist, Ray C.
1970 Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations: The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education. Harvard Educational Review 1.40:411-451.
An observational study of negative self-fulfilling prophecy information in ghetto children over a three year period (kindergarten to second grade). It is concluded that the teacher's behavior greatly influences the achievement level of the children.

Rosenfeld, Gerry
1971 Shut Those Thick Lips!: A Study of Slum School Failure. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
An anthropological study of interracial processes in a Harlem public elementary school. The author explores the implications of why the achievement of minority youngsters is slow.

Rosenthal, Robert and Lenore Jacobson
1968 Pygmalion in the Classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.
Using the concept of self-fulfilling prophecy, Rosenthal's data demonstrates how the teacher's expectations of the student becomes in fact a significant definer of the student's performance level.

Shibutani, Tamotsu
1955 Reference Groups as Perspectives. American Journal of Sociology 60:562-569.
The author explores the concept of reference group as it is used in research and the literature. He concludes that reference group can best be defined if its definition is restricted to the group which provides the frame of reference for the actor.

Singleton, John
1974 Implications of Education as Cultural Transmission. *In* Education and Cultural Process: Toward an Anthropology of Education. George Spindler, Ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. pp. 26-38.
The author explores the implications of defining education as cultural transmission. He also suggests some anthropological strategies for educational research.

Snyder, Eldon
Self-Concept Theory: An Approach to Understanding the Behavior of Disadvantaged Pupils. *In* Interpreting Education: A Sociological Perspective. Edward Drabick, Ed. New York: Appleton Century-Crofts.
The author summarizes self-concept theory and applies it to the implications for studying the education of lower class

child. The problems of low self-esteem are explored.

IMPLICATIONS FOR CLASSROOM OBSERVATION

As with so much of the research on school desegregation, the methods which have been used for classroom observation are structural systems which take a specialized approach to selected variables or categories of behavior. Today, a multitude of specific instruments exist for classroom observation (Simon and Boyer 1968; Westbury and Bellack 1971; Grant and Hennings 1971; Cartwright and Cartwright 1974; Good and Brophy 1970; Willower 1975; Hoy 1969; Rexford et al. 1972; Helsel and Willower 1974). All these approaches share a common shortcoming in their operational use: they necessarily impose a pre-designed structure on social reality. At the other end of the continuum, a number of field observation techniques, often lumped together as "participant observation," usually use systematic observation without closure. This approach is also beginning to be represented in the research literature (Walker and Adelman 1975; Jackson 1968; Smith and Geoffery 1968; Burnett 1973). In the former approach the contextual aspects are specified before observation begins. In the latter approach there is an attempt to keep field methods flexible enough to allow categories to emerge. We have argued that this principle of emergence is of major importance for a valid and reliable assessment of the impact of school desegregation on classroom processes. Such a field stance allows for observation of desegregation from both macro and micro levels of analysis. As this review indicates, any research system must take these factors into consideration and attempt to discriminate their effects.

It is also obvious that, for classroom observation, one must be aware of those organizational characteristics peculiar to the school setting. Starting with Waller (1932) a substantial body of research exists that has utilized a field methods perspective. Two extensive bibliographies on this method exist (Wolcott 1975; Burnett 1974). More recently, Ianni (1975) has developed a social organization framework involving the domains of sorting, territoriality and autonomy for studying the school. A similar approach has earlier been applied to the analysis of the classroom (Jensen 1955). One must again call attention to the work of Jackson (1968) and of Smith who carried the insights of his qualitative work into the more quantitative domain (Smith and Kleine 1969). In a similar vein Walberg (1969) has applied the field originated concepts of physical and psychological distance in the classroom to a statistical mode of inquiry. Jules Henry's work on classroom climate (1957, 1959) was another early and pioneering approach to field analysis of school and classroom settings. Furthermore, anyone interested in exploring the research on social control in schools should consult Willover's summary in *The Encyclopaedia of Education* (1971). As mentioned earlier, this approach has not been confined to the United States. Hargreaves (1975) and his associates in England have applied the theoretical orientation of the labelling perspective to a study of deviance in classrooms, also the work of Walker and Adelman (1975).

Indeed, this is only a sampling of the literature that exists in this area. What is important about this approach, we again argue, is that its holistic framework allows for the observation, documentation, and analysis of what really happens in classrooms. Such an approach becomes even more relevant when such metro or cultural level factors such as ethnicity or culture contact are to be considered.

There is now a limited but growing body of literature that deals with the field methods approach to ethnicity/race and education. Its interpretation, however, is still problematic. Erickson, for example, investigated the counseling style of junior college advisors in an application of the theoretical orientation of Barth, Goffman, and theorists from the labeling perspective. The following passage clearly illustrates the confusion applied research or desegregation can generate for policy makers:

> While our research does not imply that ethnically segregated educational settings are superior to desegregated ones, it does show that ethnicity cannot be ignored. We

> have found that ethnicity, race and communication style can affect the quality of counseling students receive. Because these factors are an integral part of face-to-face interaction, they probably affect other interactions in the school and therefore are important educational variables. It seems that our schools would profit greatly if they discovered and used the distinctive educational possibilities of both inter-group and intra-group contact among adults and young people in schools. (Erickson, 1975:68)

Evidence that desegregation as a form of culture conflict can be harmful can be found in some sources. In his study on school failure, for example, McDermott notes:

> Because behavioral competence is differently defined by different social groups, many children and teachers fail in their attempts to establish rational, trusting and rewarding relationships across ethnic, racial or class boundaries in the classroom. As a result of this miscommunication, school learning is shunned by many minority children, and school failure becomes a peer group goal. The high rate of reading disabilities among minority children can be explained in terms of such miscommunication. The difficulty is usually neither "dumb kids" nor "racist teachers," but cultural conflict. (McDermott 1974:82)

But, again the reader must be aware that for as long as acculturation has been taking place the problem of culture conflict has existed in the schools and is not a function of desegregation. In his study of minority group status and adolescent culture Ianni goes back a generation and briefly describes what it was like to be in an Italo-American teenage culture:

> What was happening to us, and what I suggest happens to most minority teen-age groups, is that we were discovering (and in some cases inventing) behavior norms from the surrounding dominant culture and these norms conflicted with what our parents expected of us. We had not developed a new Italo-American teen-age culture—an all-inclusive system of behavior which provided guides for everyday life—we had simply found some ways by which to adjust conflicting parent-expectations with dominant culture expectations. What emerged for us was not a distinctly Italo-American pattern of behavior but rather what have come to be called "contracultural patterns of values and behaviors based on conflict." (1964:220)

All of this has implications for the student's role and self-concept. It is not merely a problem of ethnic stratification but economic stratification as well. In her study of schools in poverty areas Dawson notes:

> The majority of ghetto youth, as a result of their environment and cultural patterns, grow up in a sea of conflicts as to what to think about themselves. Most professionals and confused parents do not give them much help in improving their self-concepts. In many cases they only compound the confusion by not even listening to how youths feel about themselves and those around them. (Dawson 1968)

The field work perspective to desegregation research seems to indicate that the kinds of things the courts were trying to erridicate on the macro-societal level seem to persist in the more micro aspects of everyday life in the schools.

> It appears that the public school system not only mirrors the configurations of the larger society, but also significantly contributes to maintaining them. Thus the system of public education in reality perpetuates what it is ideologically committed to eradicate—class barriers which result in inequality in the social and economic life of the citizenry. (Rist 1970:449)

Understanding desegregation as a social process, then, requires that we look at the process where it occurs as a necessary first step in understanding its social policy implications.

Concluding Comments

Documenting the social world within which desegregation is taking place is not an easy task. Attempting to create a change in it is even more difficult. Our review of legal decision making has shown how the courts have consistently tried to mandate change. The classroom observation research shows us that the success of what they have attempted can be debated for a variety of reasons—substantive, methodological, and theoretical. Despite the huge body of documentation on this subject we feel that we have uncovered a number of significant gaps and that the field methods perspective has an important contribution to make to the dialogue between applied research and policy.

A final word of caution. Definitive literature searches are idealized constructs. The actual process of development has a "snowball" or multiplier effect: the more one's curiosity is aroused, the broader and more diverse become the scope of the inquiry. In that light we urge those who use our bibliography as a starting point for developing their own hypotheses about what school desegregation really means. Some advice can be taken from Redfield who echos the point with which we began:

> None of us can truly say that his way of work is necessarily the best way or that it either should or will prevail over all others. All advance in knowledge is a dialectic, a conversation. (Redfield 1960:148)

Burnett, Jacquetta

1973 Event Description and Analysis in the Microethnography of Urban Classrooms. *In* Cultural Relevance and Educational Issues. Francis A. J. Ianni and Edward Storey, Eds. Boston: Little, Brown, pp. 287-303.

By the use of the mixed method of network and event analysis the author analyzes the ethnography of the urban classroom.

1974 Anthropology and Education: An Annotated Bibliographic Guide. New Haven, Conn.: HRAF Press.

The most comprehensive guide to date on research in anthropology and education.

Cartwright, Carol and G. Phillip Cartwright

1974 Developing Observation Skills. New York: McGraw-Hill.

The authors present an observation scheme for classroom behavior. Methods of observing and record keeping are presented. Rating scales are also presented.

Dawson, Helaine

1968 On the Outskirts of Hope. New York: McGraw-Hill.

This book is a discussion of the education of ghetto youth. It is based on classroom observation and discussion with two hundred students done over a three-year period. Why "traditional" classroom methods will not work in such settings are discussed. Pay particular attention to the chapter on communicating in the classroom.

Erickson, Frederick

1975 Gatekeeping and the Melting Pot: Interaction in Counseling Encounters. Harvard Educational Review 45,1:44-70.

Through an analysis of film, video tapes, and participants' reactions, the author observes how junior college counselors can act as gatekeepers to minority group members. The author does note that the effects of race, ethnicity, and cultural style can be canceled out by other factors.

Good, Thomas and Jane Brophy

1970 Teacher-Child Dyadic Interactions: A New Method of Classroom Observation. Journal of School Psychology 8,2:131-137.

A method for studying the dyadic interaction between teacher and student is presented along with a coding system.

Grant, Barbara and Dorothy Hennings

1971 The Teacher Moves: An Analysis of Non-Verbal Activity. New York: Teachers College Press.

A discussion of the effects of a teacher's non-verbal activity in the classroom. Statistical evidence is presented that explores the factors related to non-verbal clues and strategies.

Hargreaves, David, Stephen Hester, and Frank Mellor

1975 Deviance in Classrooms. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Through the use of the labeling perspective and field observation the nature of deviant behavior in classrooms is explored. The implications for theory, research, and practical application are discussed.

Helsel, A. Ray and Donald Willower

1974 Toward Definition and Measurement of Pupil Control Behavior. Journal of Educational Administration 12, 1:114-123.

In another discussion of the Pupil Control Ideology, Ray and Willower present a discussion of a companion measure in pupil control behavior.

Henry, Jules

1957 Docility or Giving Teacher What She Wants. Journal of Social Issues 11,2:33-41.

Study of elementary school children. The signal response mechanism between students and teachers is explored. It is concluded that students relate to teachers in terms of seeking acceptance.

1959 Spontaneity, Initiative, and Creativity in Suburban Classrooms. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 29:266-279.

Through the use of direct observation the author studies classroom climate. It is concluded that spontaneity and initiative can be threatening in terms of the teacher's loss of control. Implications of a broader cultural context are referred to.

Hoy, Wayne K.

1969 Pupil Control Ideology and Organizational Socialization. The School Review, pp. 257-265.

Hoy applies the Pupil Control Ideology to organization socialization. In this case he uses the beginning teacher. Implications for roles are discussed. Possible applications to other statuses within schools.

Ianni, Francis A. J.

1964 Minority Group Status and Adolescent Culture. *In* The American Adolescent. David Gottlieb and Charles E. Ramsey, Eds. New York: Dorsey Press, pp. 219-247.

Ianni discusses the problems of adolescence of the Italo-American teenager. Reference is also made to Jewish and black teenagers. Particular attention should be paid to the section on minority group status and adolescent behavior.

1975 Studying Schools as Social Systems: A Manual for Field Research in Education. New York: Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute, Teachers College, Columbia University.

A comparative study on the organizational structure of three high schools through the use of field methods. The concepts of sorting, territoriality, and autonomy are developed in light of the field findings.

Jackson, Phillip

1968 Life in Classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

This book is a description of elementary school classroom life. Jackson relates empirical work to his own observations noting, "classroom life, in my judgement, is too complex an affair to be viewed or talked about from any single perspective." The reader should note in particular chapter five on the need for new perspectives.

Jensen, Gale E.

1955 The Social Structure of the Classroom Group. Journal of Educational Psychology 46:362-374.

Written by a psychologist, this article argues for the need to be aware of the social structure of the classroom. The following dimensions are identified and discussed: problem-solving, authority-leadership, power, friendship, personal prestige, sex, and priviledge.

McDermott, R. P.

1974 Achieving School Failure: An Anthropological Approach to Illiteracy and Social Stratification. *In* Education and Cultural Process. George Spindler, Ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, pp. 82-118.

Application of culture-contact conflict to an analysis of the social system of the classroom. Author calls attention to differing communication styles among differing social groups. How this leads to school failure is discussed.

Redfield, Robert

1960 The Little Community. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

A review of the research on small communities with an emphasis on theoretical underpinnings.

Rexford, G. et al.

1972 Teacher Pupil Control Ideology and Classroom Verbal Behavior. Journal of Experimental Education 40,4:78-82.

Authors apply PCI to teacner's classroom behavior. Differences between custodial oriented teachers and humanistically oriented teachers are discussed.

Rist, Ray C.

1970 Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations: The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education. Harvard Educational Review, pp. 411-51.

Rist's study is based on the observation of ghetto children during their kindergarten, first, and second grade years. He finds that teachers' behavior toward different groups influences the achievement level of the children. The implications of this show how schools reinforce society's class structure.

Simon, Anita and E. Gil Boyer

1968 Mirrors for Behavior: An Anthology of Classroom Observation Instruments. Classroom Interaction Newsletter 3,2.

This special edition of the newsletter contains a collection of twenty-six systems for classroom observation.

Smith, Louis and William Geoffrey

1968 The Complexities of an Urban Classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

A study on the development of urban classroom microethnography.

Smith, Louis and Paul Kleine

1969 Teacher Awareness: Social Cognition in the Classroom. The School Review, pp. 245-256.

The authors apply the concept of "teacher awareness" through the use of statistical procedures. It was found that teacher awareness is related to pupil esteem.

Walberg, Herbert

1969 Physical and Psychological Distance in the Classroom. The School Review, pp. 64-71.

Through the use of quantitative measures the authors found that where a student sits can be related to biographical items. Friendship patterns were also felt to be an important variable.

Walker, Rob and Clem Adelman

1975 A Guide to Classroom Observation. London: Methwan and Co., Ltd.

A handbook for observation methods. The authors present various forms of unstructured (including photographs) and some structured methods. This book is suitable for the untrained observer.

Waller, Willard

1932 The Sociology of Teaching. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

One of the first studies of the field methods approach to observation in schools, this work has become a classic. While historically important, its conclusions are still relevant to today's school settings.

Westbury, Ian and Arno Bellack, Eds.

1971 Research into Classroom Processes. New York: Teachers College Press.

A discussion of articles by various authors is presented that reviews the current status of research in classroom processes. Fundamental questions are explored, recent developments assessed, and implications for the future are reviewed.

Willower, Donald

1971 Social Control in Schools. *In* The Encyclopaedia of Education. L. C. Deighton, Ed. New York: Macmillan, pp. 245-253.

A survey of research to date dealing with research on social control in schools.

1975 Some Comments of Inquiries on Schools and Pupil Control. Teacher College Record 77,2:219-230.

The author discusses the current literature on pupil control with reference to the Pupil Control Ideology and its meaning for the organizational structure.